

**A COMPARISON OF HOMOSEXUAL AND
HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS AND AN
EXAMINATION OF ATTITUDES TOWARD
HOMOSEXUALITY.**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts (Psychology).

Elizabeth Anne Casey.

**University of Canterbury
February, 1990.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	p.1
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	p.2
1. IN THE BEGINNING.....	p.2
2. RELATIONSHIP DYNAMICS.....	p.4
3. ATTITUDE RESEARCH.....	p.13
3.1. Homophobia: The Term.....	p.14
3.2. Sex Differences in Attitudes.....	p.16
3.3. The Interaction Effect.....	p.19
3.4. Why the Observed Interaction Effect?.....	p.22
3.5. Attitudes Toward Women and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals.....	p.25
4. OTHER RESEARCH AREAS.....	p.27
4.1. Cross Cultural Studies of Attitudinal Sex Differences.....	p.27
4.2. The Behavioural Studies.....	p.28
4.3. General Personality and Demographic Characteristics Typical of Antihomosexual Individuals.....	p.30
4.4. Attitudes and AIDS.....	p.31
5. RATIONAL.....	p.32
6. HYPOTHESES.....	p.34
CHAPTER TWO: METHOD	p.35
7. SUBJECTS.....	p.35
8. SETTINGS AND PERSONNEL.....	p.35
9. MATERIALS.....	p.35
9.1. The Research Questionnaires.....	p.35
9.2. Liking and Loving scales: (Rubin, 1973).....	p.36
9.3. General Questions.....	p.37
9.4. Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals scale: (Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980).....	p.37

9.5. Attitudes Toward Women scale: (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1973).....	p.39
10. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.....	p.40
10.1. Sexual Orientation.....	p.40
10.2. Matched Samples.....	p.40
11. PROCEDURE.....	p.42
12. RESEARCH DESIGN.....	p.43
12.1. Condition 1.....	p.43
12.2. Condition 2.....	p.43
12.3. Condition 3.....	p.44
CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS	p.45
13. THE SAMPLE.....	p.45
14. LIKING AND LOVING.....	p.45
15. GENERAL QUESTIONS.....	p.47
16. HETEROSEXUAL ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALS.....	p.49
17. THE TWO ATTITUDE MEASURES.....	p.50
18. MANOVA.....	p.51
19. GENERAL STATISTICS.....	p.52
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION	p.53
20. LIKING AND LOVING.....	p.53
20.1. General Questions.....	p.56
21. ATTITUDES.....	p.59
21.1. The Interaction Effect.....	p.64
21.2. Attitudes Toward Women and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals.....	p.68
22. FUTURE RESEARCH AREAS.....	p.69
23. LIMITATIONS.....	p.70
24. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	p.71
REFERENCE LIST	p.73-p.79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	p.80-p.83

ABSTRACT

This study was intended to assess the effects of sex and sexual orientation on measures of liking and loving for partner and on responses to some general questions regarding homosexual relationships. It was also intended to establish whether gender is a significant determinant of attitudes toward homosexuals in general, and toward homosexuals of one's own sex, in particular. The final objective was to discover if there is any relationship between attitudes toward women and attitudes toward homosexuals. A total of one hundred subjects was employed (fifty homosexual and fifty heterosexual males and females) to examine these factors. Relationship dynamics were examined using Rubin's (1973) "Liking and Loving scales" and attitudes were measured using the "Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals Scale" (Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980), and the "Attitudes Toward Women Scale" (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1973). Four additional questions were asked in an effort to gain some general information about attitudes toward homosexuals.

The results on the whole were favourable and were mainly consistent with the hypotheses. The first and third hypotheses were wholly supported by the results. The findings with regard to hypothesis two were a little less conclusive, with a significant main effect being gained and a non significant interaction effect. Conclusions were made to the effect that homosexual and heterosexual relationships are remarkably similar and responses to the general questions implied that heterosexuals may slowly be coming to this realisation. Consistent with expectations gender was found to be a powerful predictor of attitudes (with males showing greater rejection of homosexuals than females), but the hypothesis that heterosexuals would be more rejecting of homosexuals of their own sex was not supported. Scores on the two attitude measures were highly correlated as predicted, therefore it was concluded that attitudes toward women and attitudes toward homosexuals are highly related.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. IN THE BEGINNING...

Research in the area of homosexuality has grown both in terms of volume and content. Although the growth has been concentrated in the last ten to fifteen years, there has been a marked increase since the Gay liberation movements of the 1960's and 1970's. Prior to these two decades the research dealt mainly with the causes of, and cures for homosexuality, due to the common belief that it was a form of psychopathology. Consequently, little knowledge was acquired at this stage as a result of the severe misrepresentation of the homosexual population by the use of psychiatric patients for research purposes. It is, however, important to acknowledge the work of a few insightful researchers who had a more liberal view of homosexuality even at this early stage. For example, there was the work of Kinsey and his colleagues in the late 1940's who deserve a great deal of credit for legitimising sexual research and showing that homosexuality was far more prevalent than had ever before been imagined. Kinsey revealed that:

" ...37 percent of the total male population has at least some overt homosexual experience to the point of orgasm between adolescence and old age..." (Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin, 1948, p.650).

Ford and Beach (1951) (cited in Morin, 1977) contested the belief that homosexuality was an unnatural phenomenon by showing that it occurred in most species and in most human societies. Hooker (1957) (cited in Cabaj, 1988) challenged the assumption that homosexuality was psychopathological;

using standard projective tests she showed that clinicians were unable to distinguish the sexual orientation of homosexual and heterosexual subjects¹.

More recently, Reiss, Safer and Yotive (1974) (cited in La Torre and Wendenberg, 1983) and Clark (1975) (cited in Laner, 1977) all concluded that there were no significant differences between male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals in either personality or psychopathology. Finally, with the realisation that homosexuality did not in fact constitute deviant sexual behaviour or mental disorder (and its subsequent removal from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual 3, on the 15th December 1973), there came a number of important changes.

"Through intensive lobbying and political activism, bolstered by the growing body of scientific literature challenging the psychopathological view of the homosexual orientation (eg; Freedman, 1971; Hart et al 1978; Hooker, 1975) lesbians, gay men and their supporters eventually pressured the American Psychiatric Association to remove homosexuality from its Diagnostic and Statistical Manual as a form of Mental Illness..." (Herek, 1984, p.2).

As a result of the above influences researchers began to look in new directions and became interested in such things as, the dynamics involved in homosexual relationships, comparison of homosexual and heterosexual relationships, psychological adjustment of homosexuals and attitudes toward homosexuals. Such topics now constitute the majority of research in this area and are representative of a more enlightened outlook on homosexuality. A brief outline of some of this research follows.

¹ Hooker was one of the first to use non patient samples and warned against the use of such a biased sample.

2. RELATIONSHIP DYNAMICS

Psychologists have been studying relationship dynamics and romantic love in heterosexual couples for many years. All have made, and some still are making, important contributions to our understanding and have broken down many barriers surrounding scientific study in this area (e.g. Dion and Dion, 1973; Lee, 1973; Sternberg, 1986). However, as a rule the realm of homosexual relationships has been somewhat neglected in comparison, almost as if romantic love and relationships were specific to the domain of heterosexuality. The exception to this rule were the Social Psychologists of the early 1970's who pioneered the research on homosexual couples and their relationships and applied research techniques that had previously been reserved for the study of heterosexual couples.

The development of Rubin's liking and loving scales (1973) facilitated the comparison of homosexual and heterosexual relationships, and many researchers have used these scales on their own, or in conjunction with other measures, in order to make such comparisons. For example, Kurdek and Schmitt (1986a) assessed relationship quality on multiple dimensions such as liking, loving and relationship satisfaction, and found no significant differences between gay, lesbian and heterosexual couples on these factors. The only difference found was that cohabiting partners had the lowest love for partner, and relationship scores.

Kurdek and Schmitt (1986b) compared four types of couple (heterosexual married, heterosexual cohabiting, gay and lesbian) with the first three stages of relationship development (McWhirter and Mattison, 1984)² on five

² Because relationships change over time, stage of relationship development is an important methodological consideration. The *blending* stage occurs in the first year and is characterised by merging, limerance and frequent sexual activity. The *nesting* stage includes the second and third years and is characterised by homemaking, compatibility and decline in limerance. The *maintaining* stage involves the fourth and fifth

dimensions of relationship quality; agreement, satisfaction with affection and sex, low tension, shared activity and beliefs about sexual perfection. Relationship quality was found to be more frequently related to stage of relationship than type of couple. The four couple types were indistinguishable on liking and loving, with the cohabiting couples having the lowest love for partner and relationship satisfaction.

Consideration of relationship quality on a more general level leads one to the considerable amount of work done in the area by Peplau, who utilised the skills and methods acquired from her own studies of heterosexual relationships and applied them to homosexual relationships.³ In terms of liking and loving Peplau found no significant differences (between homosexuals and heterosexuals) in the likelihood or the depth of liking and loving felt for one's partner. Individuals from both groups were found to have similar attitudes toward entering and having a relationship, and gender (maleness and femaleness) was found to have more bearing on a relationship than sexual orientation.

"Women's goals in intimate relationships are similar whether the partner is male or female. The same is true of men."
(Peplau, 1981, p.29)

years and is characterised by the reappearance of the individual and risk taking. The fourth stage is called the *building* stage which involves collaboration, and establishing dependability of the partner. The *releasing* stage involves years eleven through twenty and includes trust and taking each other for granted. Finally, beyond twenty years is described as the *renewing* stage and is characterised by achieving security, remembering and restoring the partnership. Therefore McWhirter and Mattison see relationships as moving from a state of limerance toward one of trust and security.

³ The mere use of the same research methods tends to presuppose Peplau's belief in the similarity of homosexual and heterosexual relationships.

On values and expectations in relationships Peplau found that:

"Whatever the sexual preferences, most people strongly desire a close and loving relationship with one special person. "
(Peplau, 1981, p.28).

In fact the only major difference that Peplau did find was in terms of the type of relationship experienced. That is, heterosexual relationships continue to be influenced by the social institution of marriage and the associated traditional roles. Homosexuals on the other hand tend to opt for best friendship type relationships with a romantic and erotic component.

"In contrast most homosexual couples reject husband/wife roles as a basis for a love relationship. "(Peplau, 1981, p.29)

Some would suggest that homosexuals do play roles similar to those carried out by male and female heterosexuals. This is commonly referred to as the "butch-femme" dichotomy which rests on the assumption that one partner in a homosexual relationship acts out the dominant ('male') role and the other plays the submissive ('female') role. Peplau did find a small amount of such role playing but mainly in lower socioeconomic levels, older couples of both sexes, or a newcomer to the homosexual community wanting to be identified. It has been suggested that the lack of such role playing in homosexual relationships may, in fact, lead to more successful relationships.

"For example, 'creative opposition' to conventionality, Freedman (1975) held, might produce more egalitarian sex roles among homosexuals than among heterosexuals: "The shared wisdom of the gay world is that two men or two women living together as mates quickly see the limitations of stereotyped sex roles. Breadwinner/homemaker and

dominant/submissive dichotomies just aren't as important to gays as they are to most people." (Laner, 1977, p.22)

Peplau and Cochran (1980) asked lesbians and gay men to rate the importance of various features of the love relationship such as; revealing intimate feelings, spending time together, holding similar attitudes, having an equal power relationship and sexual exclusivity. There were some individual differences but remarkably few overall group differences between male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals. The major differences that did emerge were firstly, that heterosexuals valued sexual exclusivity far more than homosexuals, and secondly, females of both orientations thought emotional expressiveness, shared feelings and an egalitarian relationship were more important than did males.

Peplau and Cochran (1980) also compared matched samples of homosexuals and heterosexuals on loving and liking and found no significant differences.

"Lesbians and gay males reported high love for their partners, indicating strong feelings of attachment, caring and intimacy. They also score high on the liking scale, reflecting feelings of respect and affection toward their partners." (Peplau and Gordan, in Allgeier and McCormick, 1983, p.236)

Blasband and Peplau (1985) used Rubin's (1973) liking and loving scales on gay males in open and closed relationships. 93 percent said they were in love with their partner, and men in both open and closed relationships were indistinguishable on scores of liking and loving. Moreover, there were no significant differences found on measures of satisfaction and commitment.

In general Peplau concludes from her research that most individuals, regardless of sexual orientation, want much the same thing from love relationships, as the following quote indicates:

"We have found little evidence for a distinctive homosexual 'ethos' or orientation toward love relationships. There are many commonalities in the values most people bring to intimate relationships." (Peplau, 1981, p.33)

Duffy and Rusbult (1986) and Schullo and Alperson (1984) also found striking similarities in the relationship dynamics of homosexual and heterosexual couples. The former used Rusbult's Investment model (1980, 1983), designed to explore the determinants of satisfaction with, and commitment to, maintaining a relationship. This was administered to a sample of male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals. It was found that the Investment model adequately predicted satisfaction and commitment for all four groups, although female homosexuals and heterosexuals reported greater investment and greater commitment to maintaining a relationship. Duffy and Rusbult concluded from this that:

" The close relationships of lesbians, gay men and heterosexual women and men are really quite similar, driven by similar general forces. What differences do emerge appear to result more from gender than from sexual preference. " (Duffy and Rusbult, 1986, p.21)

It is important to note that until Duffy and Rusbult's (1986) study many models had been used to account for satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual relationships but not homosexual relationships. Duffy and Rusbult (1986) wanted to discover if the determinants of satisfaction and commitment were the same for homosexuals and heterosexuals which begs the question: is there any reason to believe that homosexuals would be less satisfied or committed? Dailey (1977) and Peplau and Gordon (1983) replied in the affirmative to this on the following grounds. Firstly, that homosexuals have greater difficulty in establishing a relationship in a homophobic

environment; secondly, they have less familial, societal and legal support for doing so; and lastly, they have fewer barriers to leave the relationship.⁴

These arguments are weakened by the aforementioned findings of Duffy and Rusbult (1986) and their discovery that the determinants of satisfaction and commitment are similar for homosexuals and heterosexuals. In fact when one considers the difficulties (as outlined above) homosexuals suffer when attempting to establish a relationship it is even more incredible they succeed in the face of such adversity.

Schullo and Alperson (1984) not only concluded that there were no differences in homosexual and heterosexual relationship dynamics, but also made some very important observations about the state of the research in this area. For example, they highlighted the sampling problems created by the use of a hidden population such as homosexuals and consequently the need for studies to always include the catchphrase "among those willing to participate." This, of course, creates major problems with external validity.

There have also been problems with the use of poorly designed instruments for measurement and the failure to use a full factorial model⁵. Schullo and Alperson (1984) looked at sixteen studies between 1971 and 1981 and only one escaped criticism for not using a full factorial design and that was by Peplau and Cochran (1980). All the rest focused on one cell (gay or lesbian) or collapsed across cells and thus compared homosexuals and heterosexuals without regard to sex. The latter problem usually arose from the use of attitude measures that only referred to "homosexuals" and failed to specify sex. These problems have been experienced to some extent in a large number

⁴ Homosexuals are less likely to share children and/or property, do not have marital bonds to break and may have more relationship options due to less sexual exclusivity, especially gay males.

⁵ A design among two levels of sex and two levels of sexual orientation.

of studies and Schullo and Alperson (1984) stated that as a result of these, and other problems, confidence in conclusions must remain rather weak. In fact they suggest that:

"The only firm conclusions that can be drawn are that gay males and lesbians can have enduring and satisfying relationships (Cardell, Finn, and Maracek, 1981; Chaffee, 1976; Dailey, 1979; Peplau and Cochran, 1981; Peplau, Cochran, Rook and Padesky, 1978; Ramsey, Latham and Lindquist, 1978; Westmoreland, 1975), and that the stereotype of one member of a dyad acting as a "wife" and the other acting as a "husband" has been refuted (Bass-Hass, 1968; Bell and Weinberg, 1978; Harry, 1976, 1979; Harry and DeVall 1978; Jay and Young, 1977;...Peplau and Gordon, 1982; Saghir and Robins 1973,...)" (Schullo and Alperson, 1984, p.983-4)

Dailey (1979) also gained results that refute the generalised assumptions that some people tend to hold with regard to homosexual relationships. Dailey (1979) wished to assess the dynamics of long-term, same sex relationships and therefore compared homosexual couples with heterosexual married and non-married couples. Using seven self report measures Dailey found striking similarities between the three groups in terms of the success of the permanent pairing relationship studied.

" The data from the CRI (Caring Relationships Inventory) may suggest that qualities of love between permanently paired homosexuals are essentially equivalent to the love in heterosexual couples, married or non-married." (Dailey, 1979, p.156)

Engel and Saracino (1986) conducted one of the few studies that included bisexuals in the sample. They looked at self reported love preferences and

ideals of homosexuals, heterosexuals and bisexuals, and found major similarities between the three groups on these measures.

Bisexuals are generally not included in homosexual research samples for a number of reasons. For example, they are not considered to belong to either the homosexual or the heterosexual population; some say they belong along this continuum while others maintain that they are a unique population independent of homosexuals and heterosexuals. Whatever the belief it all comes down to the same conclusion and that is that bisexuals are generally not included in such research because of their suspected confounding effects:

"...the research on homosexuality is thoroughly confounded by the inclusion of large numbers of bisexuals as homosexuals, making that research difficult to interpret...Comparisons show that bisexuals often differ significantly from homosexuals and heterosexuals." (MacDonald, 1983, p.94)

LaTorre and Wendenburg (1983) also warned against the use of bisexuals as part of the homosexual sample as they said it could lead to contamination of the homosexual sample. In support of this they separated these groups in their studies. For example, they looked at the psychological characteristics (masculinity, femininity, and self esteem) of bisexual, homosexual, and heterosexual women. Ellis (1962) and Kenyon (1968) are two other researchers (cited in MacDonald, 1983) who have made comparisons between these three groups.

"Overall, Kenyon's study shows that bisexual females differ from both lesbians and heterosexual women, and therefore should not be included as homosexuals in homosexual study samples." (MacDonald, 1983, p.97)

Cardell, Finn and Maracek (1981) examined the ability of homosexuals to achieve a close love relationship by comparing lesbians, gay males and heterosexuals on a measure of couple adjustment. No significant difference was found between these groups, just as Ramsey, Latham and Lindquist (1978) (cited in Peplau, 1982) failed to find a significant difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals on a measure of marital adjustment.

Homosexuals, especially males, have often been viewed as promiscuous and incapable of having enduring, committed relationships, despite research evidence to the contrary. For example, Bell and Weinberg (1978), Jay and Young (1977), Peplau, Cochran, Rook and Padesky (1978), all conducted studies in which between 45 and 80 percent of lesbians were in steady relationships. Peplau and Cochran (1981), Spada (1979), Bell and Weinberg (1978), and Jay and Young (1977), found that 45 to 60 percent of their subjects were in steady relationships (Peplau and Gordan, in Allgeier and McCormick, 1983). Dailey (1979) also concluded that:

" Contrary to popular opinion that most homosexual relationships are short term, there also exist long term relationships between homosexual couples" (Dailey, 1979, p.144)

These results, of course, should not be taken as representative of all homosexuals as it could be that homosexuals in steady relationships are more likely to participate in studies. Others, on the other hand, may be secretive about their sexual orientation and hence not volunteer for psychological research. Whatever the case may be, the research tends to point to the fact that homosexuals do have long term relationships.

The research in this area has been plagued with methodological problems, especially those related to sampling, but despite these it has yielded some very

interesting results. Researchers can take credit for empirically illustrating that there is little difference between the ideals and the realities of homosexual and heterosexual relationships, and for demonstrating that homosexuals and heterosexuals are remarkably similar in what they want from, bring to, and experience in, a relationship. It appears that the differences that have been found (such as the homosexual tendency to reject traditional gender-based roles in relationships, greater reported equality, especially with respect to lesbians, and less sexual exclusivity) are arguably positive steps or differences.

In addition to this it can be concluded that sexual preference has little bearing on relationship quality or satisfaction: factors such as gender, stage of relationship development and whether the partners are cohabiting have a far greater impact.

"In sum, the picture that emerges from these studies is that most people, whatever their sexual orientation, want much the same thing from love relationships; namely, affection and companionship." (Peplau and Gordon, in Allgeier and McCormick, 1983, p.230)

3. ATTITUDE RESEARCH

The questions regarding the reasons for the abundance of negative attitudes toward, and stereotypes about, homosexuality remain. Why, in contemporary society where homosexuality is largely legally accepted and sanctioned, does social acceptance lag so far behind? A majority of the research on homosexuality has focused on trying to answer this question by examining attitudes toward homosexuality. Possible reasons for such attitudes, whether these attitudes are positive or negative, sex differences in attitudes and the characteristics typical of a homophobic individual have all been dealt with in this research area. A summary of this research follows, but first an explanation of a term that is frequently used in this field.

3.1. Homophobia: The Term

Unfavourable attitudes toward lesbians and gay men have been variously described as *homoerotophobia* (Churchill 1968), *homosexism* (Lehne 1976), *homonegativism* (Hudson and Rickets 1980), and *heterosexism* (Morin and Garfinkle 1978); but the term that has enjoyed the most popularity is *homophobia* (Smith, 1971; Weinberg, 1972; cited in Herek, 1984). A homophobic society:

"...sees homosexuality as something bad, evil and hateful, even something to be punished and condemned. " (Cabaj; 1988, p.22)

Morin and Garfinkle (1978) looked at homophobia from both a cultural perspective and a personal one. The first sees it as a belief system that supports and maintains negative attitudes to, and stereotypes about, homosexuals. This belief system justifies discrimination against this social group in terms of housing, occupations, attitudes and language, and it values heterosexuality as superior to, and more natural than, homosexuality⁶.

The second perspective relates to the concept that negative attitudes are a phobic reaction to homosexuals. That is, homophobia has been conceptualised by some as the manifestation of irrational fears similar to any other, such as the fear of snakes. If this is indeed the case then it follows that homophobics should display classic fear reactions when confronted with the source of their fear; a homosexual. There has been some indecision as to whether this type of reaction exists.

⁶ Discrimination has also been witnessed in the research especially in the early days when homosexuality was considered to be psychopathological and patient samples were used. The use of such samples probably only served to perpetuate this myth.

For instance, McConaghy (1967) (cited in Morin) measured penile volume change to pictures of nude males and females, and as expected homosexuals and heterosexuals responded to their preferred pictures with increased volume. However, while homosexuals did not respond to either female or neutral pictures, heterosexuals responded with decreased volume to nude male pictures. McConaghy (1967) concluded from this that homosexuals do not fear females⁷ but heterosexual males may have some sort of fear of their own sexual impulses toward other males and ultimately concluded that homophobia was a fear of one's own impulses rather than a fear of others. This is in fact a theory that is also supported by MacDonald (1976) and Weinberger (1972). Therefore, these researchers observed a fear reaction in heterosexuals but not toward homosexuals as hypothesised but toward their own sexual impulses concerning such individuals.

Herek (1984a) on the other hand called for caution with the use of the term homophobia because of the very allusions this term makes to classic fear reactions. Herek (1984) stated that:

"... this reaction has not been observed among many persons expressing hostile attitudes toward homosexuality" (Herek, 1984, p.49)

If this is the case then perhaps the term homophobia is misleading in the sense that the suffix 'phobia' implies some sort of learned fear. However, as yet, there is little evidence to suggest that heterosexuals display any sort of phobic reaction to homosexuals.

⁷ The theoretical assumption at this stage was that homosexuality was a learned fear of, or aversion to, females. (Morin, 1977)

3.2. Sex Differences in Attitudes

Having explained homophobia in a general way the research that has been done in the area of attitudinal sex differences can now be discussed. Throughout history, people have tried to account for observed negative reactions to homosexuals and some of the theoretical explanations that have been proposed are as follows. William James (1890) thought that repulsion to same sex intimacy was innate and more strongly built into males than females. James (1890) accounted for the acceptance of homosexuality in some cultures by saying that habit had overcome instinct. Westermarck (1908) thought hostility was due to disgust felt by those who had developed normally under normal conditions. Freud (1905/1961) (cited in Morin and Garfinkle, 1978) thought that attraction for the same sexed parent was repressed but that if this repression was not complete then problems with homosexuals could occur. Ferenczi (1914/56) (cited in Herek, 1984) suggested that negative attitudes toward homosexuals were symptomatic of defense against affection for members of the same sex. In light of this, what are some of the more recent findings and subsequent explanations for the attitudinal sex difference that has been observed in the research literature?

A great deal of interest has been shown in the area of sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals. Research has tended to show that males are significantly more negative toward homosexuals than females are. For example, Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974) looked at sex differences, interaction effects, and whether rejection increased as a homosexual was perceived to be mentally ill or dangerous. They found males were significantly more rejecting of homosexuals in general, more rejecting of male homosexuals in particular, and less accepting of gay males who were seen to be dangerous and more easily identifiable. Males' greater rejection was attributed to a sense of personal threat, the fear of mental illness and/or the belief that male homosexuals seduce youths.

Young and Whertvine (1982) found generally negative attitudes toward homosexuals expressed by heterosexual college students in America; and more negative attitudes were expressed by males than females.

Larsen, Reed and Hoffman (1980), in the process of constructing a scale to assess attitudes toward homosexuality (Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals scale), found a significant effect for sex, whereby females appeared to be more tolerant toward homosexuals than males.

Price (1982) (cited in Kite, 1984) and Weis and Dain (1979) all found males to hold more negative attitudes than females toward homosexuals. Other researchers who have found significant sex differences include Hansen (1982a), Millham and Weinberger (1979) and Herek (1984).

Herek (1984) has done a great deal of work in the area of attitudes toward homosexuality and has even developed a theoretical framework for use in future attitude research. The framework rests on the assumption that attitudes are dependent on the functions they serve and the psychological needs they meet. Herek distinguished between three types of attitudes. 1) Experiential attitudes which are dependent on one's past interactions with homosexuals. 2) Defensive attitudes which allow us to cope with inner conflicts and anxieties by projecting them onto homosexuals and thereby reducing tensions. 3) Symbolic attitudes which are derived from socialisation experiences and result in our expressing beliefs and values consistent with our self image. For example, if one sees oneself as liberal and committed to individual rights then one is more likely to express positive attitudes about homosexuality in keeping with this self image. Herek (1984) therefore suggested that negative attitudes toward homosexuals should not be contributed to one factor, but many.

Levitt and Klassen (1974) looked at public attitudes toward homosexuals of 30 000 American adults in the 1970's as did Nyberg and Alston (1976-1977).

Both looked at demographic variables and related these to attitudes and/or levels of homophobia. Results in both cases indicated that negative attitudes toward homosexuals were rife in the white American population but males and females in both studies were equally likely to reject homosexuals (therefore no significant sex difference). It is important to note that both of these studies were public surveys and not psychological studies as such, and this may have had some bearing on the results gained. Glenn and Weaver (1979), MacDonald (1974) and Smith (1971) also found no evidence to support the theory of attitudinal sex differences.

A problem encountered in this area has been that many researchers have used only male subjects, thereby making it impossible to consider sex differences (for example, Karr; 1978 and Sobel; 1976; cited in Kite, 1984). In an effort to gain some conclusive evidence from these otherwise unclear results Kite (1984) conducted a meta-analytic review on the attitudinal sex difference research. Kite (1984) analysed 24 studies and looked at several different independent variables, (sex of author, sex of target, sample size, type of questionnaire and year of publication) to see how these factors influenced the effect sizes obtained. The results of the analysis showed that:

"Although the effect is small, it indicates that men have more negative attitudes toward homosexuals than do women." (Kite, 1984, p.75)

However, Kite (1984) goes on to say that most of this difference can be accounted for by sample size, year of publication (as methods and measures become more sophisticated) and possibly sex of target homosexual. Therefore, sex differences in attitudes appear to have been a consistent research finding but a more sophisticated analysis of these results has shown that the effect may, in fact, be rather small.

3.3. The Interaction Effect

In addition to her work on sex differences in attitudes Kite (1984) also considered the research on interaction effects in attitudes toward homosexuals. This research has concentrated on whether male and female heterosexuals are more rejecting of homosexuals of their own sex than of the opposite sex. Karr (1978), Millham, San Miguel, and Kellogg (1976), Weinberger and Millham (1979) and Millham and Weinberger (1977), all gained an interaction effect whereby attitudes were dependent on the sex of the homosexual target:

"...results suggest that males are more negative toward male homosexuals than female subjects are but that there is little sex difference in attitudes toward lesbians." (Kite, 1984, p.77).

Problems were encountered in that the number of studies dealing with this issue were small and the sex of the homosexual target was often unspecified which made examination of the interaction effect impossible. That is, subjects were often required to simply "think of a homosexual" when responding to a questionnaire. The problem with this becomes evident when one notes that when the sex of the target homosexual is unspecified most people will think of a male.

"Black and Stevenson (1983) have reported that when sex of target is not specified, 75% of all males and 41% of all females reported thinking only of males while completing the questionnaire. Further, 53% of the females and 25% of the males reported thinking of both males and females. Six % of the females and none of the males, reported thinking of females only." (Kite, 1984, p.77)

Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974) showed that male homosexuals are more likely to be rejected than female homosexuals and male subjects are more rejecting of homosexuals than female subjects:

"...the sex of the deviant is a factor in the differential rejection of the homosexual only for the male subject." (Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1978, p.63).

In addition to this Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974) suggested that in American society male homosexuals may be seen as lacking in masculinity and/or as sexual failures, and that such a difference may not be so evident in females.

"In other words, male homosexuality is defined as being more incongruent with the culturally defined sex roles than is female homosexuality." (Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, p.64, 1974)

Ward and Kassenbaum (1965) (cited in Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1974) accounted for the research finding that male heterosexuals were more rejecting and especially so of gay males by suggesting that female homosexuality has been more acceptable in society because it has been viewed as providing emotional support for women. That is, it was seen as a means of companionship rather than a sexual thing. Lesbianism has also often been thought of as a passing phase for women; nothing that cannot be cured by the right man. They also proposed that male homosexuality has been rather more of a social problem than female homosexuality, in terms of being a health hazard (their suggestion being syphilis but more recently AIDS), there are more complaints about overt male homosexual behaviour than female, and its public manifestations have been seen as more deviant. For instance, two males living together are far more suspect than two females in the same situation, in

the general view of society. In addition to all of this, there has been the oft asserted belief that male homosexuals are child molesters.

For all of these reasons gay males may be more rejected than lesbians and these factors may also play a major role in male heterosexual hostility toward homosexuals, especially gay males. Females on the other hand may not be so threatened by these factors and are therefore more tolerant of both male and female homosexuals.

Herek (1984) found males to be consistently more negative than females in attitudes toward homosexuals, especially with respect to attitudes toward gay males.

"... Herek (1984) observed consistently more negative attitudes (indicated by higher mean scale scores) among heterosexual males, than among heterosexual females especially for attitudes toward gay men."(Herek, 1984a, p.48)

Morin and Garfinkle (1978) found no such effect and concluded that males were more negative toward homosexuals regardless of the sex of the homosexual target.

In conclusion to the research on sex differences and interaction effects it can be said that Herek (1984b), Millham, San Miguel and Kellogg (1976), Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974), Weinberger and Millham (1979), and Karr (1977) were among those who found an interaction effect, whereas Morin and Garfinkle (1978) failed to find this effect. Sex differences were obtained by Brown and Amoroso (1975), Hansen (1982a), Herek (1984b), Kite (1984), Larsen, Reed and Hoffman (1980), Millham and Weinberger (1979), Weis and Dain (1979), Price (1982) and Young and Whertvine (1982), whereby males were more antihomosexual than females. Glenn and Weaver (1979), Levitt and Klassen (1974) and Nyberg and Alston (1976)

found no differences in attitudes but these studies consisted mainly of national opinion polls which may not be comparable to psychological studies (Herek 1984).

3.4. Why the Observed Interaction Effect?

One of the reasons researchers have tried to find an interaction effect has been in order to test the often advanced hypothesis that people are negative toward homosexuals because of a fear of their own unarticulated homoerotic impulses (MacDonald 1976; Weinberg 1972). It follows that an insecure individual suffering from this fear should find a homosexual of the same sex a reasonably large source of anxiety. The hypothesis that hostility toward homosexuals is due to a sense of threat to an individual's sexual identity has been disputed by Millham and Weinberger (1977) who provided results to support this disagreement and:

"...confirmed that a significant proportion of negative responsiveness toward homosexuals results from the belief that their behaviour is incongruent with their anatomical sex."
(Millham and Weinberger, 1977).

This implies that homosexuals are often disliked because they are viewed as being dissimilar and acting in discordance with what is seen as the correct or culturally prescribed manner for males and females to behave in. The reason that gay males often suffer greater rejection may be because their behaviour is seen as more incongruent with culturally defined sex roles. Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974) made this assertion when they suggested that male homosexuality appears to violate traditional sex roles to a greater degree than female homosexuality does.

The proposal that homosexuals are disliked or discriminated against because of their incongruent sex role behaviour has been heavily debated in the

research literature. For example, MacDonald and Games (1974) and MacDonald, Huggins, Young and Swanson (1973) quoted correlational data which they believe supported the theory that homosexuals are disliked because their behaviour and mannerisms threaten sex role norms. Storms (1978) however disagreed with this and gained results which suggest that homosexuals are disliked because of their sexual orientation, regardless of personal style or characteristics. Laner and Laner (1980) looked at both sides of this argument and concluded that negative attitudes are a result of both of these. They concluded that more conventional homosexuals (those who behave more in accordance with what heterosexuals see as normal gender behaviour) may be better liked. Those who display gender characteristics that are incongruent to their anatomical sex, for example a very feminine male, may be less well liked.

However, there may be many other factors that play a role. For example, early experiences may be important whereby males and females may be socialised differently with respect to homosexuals and/or minorities and this may lead to differences in attitudes in later life.

" Homosexual stereotypes presumably are learned by most people during early socialisation, apparently maintained in interaction with others and reinforced by certain professional experts as well as by the mass media. (Szasz, 1970; McCaffrey, 1972). " (Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1974, p.53).

MacDonald and Games (1974) have attributed fear of homosexuality to ignorance and/or lack of experience or direct contact and also suggest it to be related to fear of anything different.

"For example, ethologists note that many lower species and many young children have a basic dread of others whom they

perceive to be different from themselves.(Evans 1974)." (In Morin and Garfinkle, 1978, p.34)

Lesbianism, as has been mentioned, has often been seen as a passing phase and nothing that a virile man could not fix. Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier (1974) found this to be the case with their subjects as did Levitt and Klassen (1974) who conducted a public opinion survey and discovered that approximately one third of the respondents believed that at least half of the female homosexuals could be swung to heterosexuality by a sexually skilled man. However, only one quarter of Levitt and Klassen's (1974) population thought that half of the homosexual males would be converted by a sexually skilled female. If this is indeed the case then it follows that people may not see lesbianism as a long term thing and may not find it so threatening.

It is also evident that male homosexuals tend to have labels attached to them, as discovered by Karr (1975). The typical male homosexual was rated by a sample of 100 male heterosexuals as follows:

"..less good, less honest, less intellectual, less friendly, and less clean...On a masculinity factor homosexuals were rated as more delicate, more passive, more womanly, smaller, softer, and more yielding than heterosexual men." (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978, p.40)

It is more than likely that the fear of being labelled in such a way does wonders at keeping men within the bounds of male heterosexual roles, living a "normal healthy heterosexual life" and keeping them from associating with, and thinking positively about, male homosexuals. In short it may serve to interfere with the development of intimacy between men.

3.5. Attitudes Toward Women and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals

There is a substantial amount of evidence to suggest that attitudes toward women and beliefs about sex-roles for men and women are related to attitudes toward homosexuals. MacDonald, Huggins, Young and Swanson (1973), MacDonald and Games (1974), Morin and Garfinkle (1978), Smith, Resick and Kilpatrick (1980) (cited in Black and Stevenson, 1984), Weinberger and Millham (1979), and Swanson (1972) have all conducted studies; the results of which have shown that those who do not support sexual equality are more negative towards homosexuals.

"Recent work suggests that homophobia, a fear or intolerance of homosexuals, is associated with belief in traditional family ideology, derogation of females and fear of physical threat. (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978)." (In Krulewitz and Nash, 1980; p.67).

MacDonald and Games (1974) and Minnergerode (1976) (cited in Hansen, 1984) also found a strong positive correlation between sex role attitudes and attitudes toward homosexuals, and Henley and Pincus (1978) (cited in Nevid, 1983) gained a strong positive correlation between negative attitudes toward homosexuals and negative attitudes toward females and blacks. This tends to imply that people with negative attitudes toward one minority may correspondingly tend to be more negative toward other minorities, and in fact, Larsen Reed and Hoffman (1980) made this very assertion.

"The rejection of homosexuality and homosexuals is a component of the more general rejection of minorities." (Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980, p.247).

Morin and Wallace (1976) found that:

"...the best single predictor of homophobia is a belief in the traditional family ideology. That is; dominant father, submissive mother and obedient children. The second best predictor of homophobia was found to be agreement with traditional beliefs about women, e.g; that it is worse for a woman to tell dirty jokes than it is for a man. "(Morin and Garfinkle, 1978, p.31).

Minnergerode (1976) found males to be more negative and those classed as antihomosexual were significantly more antifeminist in their attitudes than those classed as prohomosexual (cited in Morin and Garfinkle, 1978).

MacDonald, Huggins, Young and Swanson (1973) suggested that negative attitudes are determined by conservative attitudes toward sex and also by the need to preserve what they refer to as the "double standard". That is, individuals tend to condemn homosexuals (by using labels such as 'butch', 'pansy' and 'fairy') in order to reduce sex-role confusion. In other words, homosexuals are condemned because of the need to reduce the confusion created by their incongruent behaviour. If individuals have strong ideas about the correct behaviours for males and females then it is suggested that this condemnation will be greater. Results confirmed the prediction that those who were more negative were more strongly in support of this double standard.

The relationship between traditional sex role attitudes and negative attitudes toward homosexuals has also been explained in terms of the similarity-attraction paradigm. That is, homosexuals may be less well liked by sex role traditionalists as they are perceived as *less* similar due to the large deviations homosexuals make from the traditional view of sex role norms. (Gurwitz and Marcus (1978) cited in Krulewitz and Nash 1977). On the other hand it may also serve to increase hostility if they are perceived as *more* similar as it may increase the sense of personal threat (Herek 1984, San Miguel and Millham

1976). However, Krulewitz and Nash (1977) gained results which suggest that:

"...sex role attitudes exert a significant effect on reactions to individual homosexuals with persons who hold relatively liberal sex role attitudes showing more acceptance of homosexuals than do persons who endorse more traditional sex role beliefs. The present study further suggests that homosexuals are disliked because they are perceived as different." (Krulewitz and Nash, 1977, p.72).

4. OTHER RESEARCH AREAS

4.1. Cross Cultural Studies of Attitudinal Sex Differences

A number of cross cultural studies have been done in this area. Brown and Amoroso (1975) examined West Indian attitudes toward homosexuals and compared the results with the findings of the Dunbar, Brown and Vuorinen (1973) study on attitudes of Canadian and Brazilian students. Both used measures of sexual liberalism/conservatism, personal sex guilt and attitudes toward homosexuality. West Indian males were found to be significantly more antihomosexual than Canadians and significantly less antihomosexual than Brazilians. Therefore, Brazilians were the most rejecting. West Indian females were less rejecting than West Indian males and less guilty about sex. Antihomosexual subjects were found to be more sex guilty and more disapproving of certain sexual practices in both the Canadian and the Brazilian sample. Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso (1973) used Canadian students and found that antihomosexual students were more intolerant of a variety of heterosexual sexual practices, were more sex guilty and showed a greater level of sex role stereotyping.

The results of these studies are consistent with the theory and findings of Churchill (1967) (cited in Brown and Amoroso, 1975) who concluded that such attitudes in America were indicative of a sex negative culture.

"...Churchill concludes that prejudice against homosexuals is an extension of the negative attitudes that Americans have toward other deviant aspects of sexual life." (Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso, 1973, p.272)

It is most important to recognise the role that cross cultural studies play in this research, as it must be appreciated that although homosexuality is condemned in some societies it is an acceptable practice in others. For example, in Turkey, Greece, and Mexico, one is not considered a man until one has had *active* homosexual experience. (The emphasis has been placed on the word *active* to impress upon the reader that *passive* homosexual encounters, wherein the male is the insertee in anal intercourse, are not considered macho). Greece is the exception here whereby neither sexual role is stigmatised as long as it is conducted in the culturally prescribed manner; that is, the older man is active and the younger man is passive. Finally, in Brazil it is considered macho to have sexual intercourse with both a male and a female prostitute, and in Papua New Guinea adolescent boys practice homosexual behaviour for years before they marry a female. Therefore, negative attitudes can be, and often are, culture specific.

4.2. The Behavioural Studies

Perhaps a more action-oriented method of approaching the study of attitudes (compared to the usual method of questionnaire and survey research) has come from the behavioural studies.

San Miguel and Millham (1976) (cited in Morin and Garfinkle, 1978) found that antihomosexual males were more punitive toward a male homosexual perceived to be similar to themselves than toward a male homosexual perceived to be dissimilar. Herek (1984) would account for this by saying that an insecure male would react more negatively to implied or perceived similarity to a male homosexual as the heterosexual male may be threatened and view this similarity as extending to his own sexual orientation. Krulewitz and Nash (1980) however found the opposite to be true whereby heterosexuals expressed greater interpersonal attraction to similar rather than dissimilar partners.

Heinemann, Pellander, Vogelbusch, and Wajtek (1981), noted physiological arousal and reduced eye contact when male subjects believed themselves to be talking to a gay male. Cuenot and Fugita (1982) (cited in Kite, 1984) noted that subjects talked faster if they believed their interviewer to be homosexual and suggested these reactions could be viewed as an anxiety response. Nevid (1983) exposed students to homoerotic stimuli (movies) and then tested their attitudes.

" Consistent with earlier findings (Larsen, Reed and Hoffman 1980; Minnergerode 1976; Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1974) males held significantly more negative attitudes toward homosexuality than females." (Nevid, 1983, p.254)

Wolfgang and Wolfgang (1971) measured interpersonal distance using stick figures and found subjects placed themselves further from homosexuals (past and present) than drug addicts, marijuana users and obese persons. Morin, Taylor and Kielman (1975) used chair placement as a measure of social distance (both of these studies cited in Morin and Garfinkle, 1978).

"Males reacted with three times as much social distance in interaction with a male experimenter who was perceived to be homosexual than did females in interaction with a female experimenter who was perceived to be homosexual." (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978, p.37)

Therefore, the behavioural studies produce similar results to those gained by other experimental methods.

4.3. General Personality and Demographic Characteristics Typical of Antihomosexual Individuals

There appear to be certain personality and demographic characteristics that tend to predispose negativity toward homosexuals; the two major personality characteristics being maleness and sex-role traditionalism, as discussed previously. However, research also shows that there are a rather large number of additional characteristics that tend to predispose this type of hostility, some of which are as follows.

Antihomosexuals are less likely to have had any previous contact with homosexuals (Hansen, Millham, San Miguel and Kellogg 1976), are more likely to think their peers are antihomosexual (Herek, 1984b; Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980), are more likely to be religious and practising (Alston, 1974; Hansen, 1982b; Herek, 1984b), tend to be older and less educated (Glenn and Weaver, 1979), more authoritarian (Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980) and are often from small rural towns (Hansen, 1982a; Levitt and Klassen, 1974). Black and Stevenson (1984), and Young and Whertvine (1982), found a correlation between level of sexual liberalism/conservatism and personal sex guilt (how guilty an individual feels about certain sexual practices), and attitudes toward homosexuals. Results showed that the more sexually conservative an individual, the more likely he/she was to reject

homosexuals. It may be argued that such characteristics presuppose a certain amount of conservatism in attitudes in general, not only in relation to homosexuals. That is, such characteristics tend to be indicative of prejudiced people.

4.4. Attitudes and the Impact of Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS)

When looking at attitudes toward homosexuality it seems foolish not to include some discussion, albeit brief, on the impact that AIDS has had on public attitudes toward homosexuals. The pertinent question is as follows; has the rapid onset of the AIDS epidemic served to increase hostility toward this group? It seems extremely likely that it would, considering homosexuals (especially gay males) have been targeted as the most at risk or susceptible group to the virus, and consequently have often been held responsible for the rapid onset and spread of this disease. As a result of this incorrect but pervasive belief, a great number of negative stereotypes have been fostered.

Herek and Glunt (1988) stated that:

" Most adults diagnosed with AIDS in this country are men who were infected through homosexual behaviour (63%)."
(Herek and Glunt, 1988, p.887).

However, they went on to point out that it is not, in fact, a gay disease but has been seen as such due to the unfortunate fact that it hit this group first and then spread outward. The Institute of Medicine (1986) backed this up by stating that:

"AIDS is overwhelmingly an epidemic of heterosexual transmission." (Herek and Glunt, 1988, p.888)

Bailey (1987) is one researcher who tried to ascertain the effect AIDS has had on attitudes and he hypothesised that males would be less sympathetic toward AIDS victims. A significant main effect was found for sex but no significant interaction effect was gained, therefore it was concluded that males were less favourable in their attitudes toward AIDS victims than females.

As a result of an unfortunate twist of fate (whereby AIDS attacked the homosexual population first) a great number of people now have a convenient new hook on which to hang their prejudice. It was doubly unfortunate, in New Zealand society, that such an occurrence came at a time when attitudes may have been improving due to the legalisation of homosexuality (Homosexual Law Reform Act). Sadly, however, it appears to have been a case of one step forward and two steps backward for the homosexual population at this stage.

5. RATIONALE

In the first section the application of the liking and loving scales (Rubin 1973) to samples of male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals was admittedly, nothing new. However, the additional questions that each individual was required to answer were novel in that they allowed respondents to have some input regarding the actual nature of his/her own relationship.

The literature thus far has been suggestive of a sex difference (Kite 1984) but is by no means conclusive as yet, therefore the role that gender plays in predicting antihomosexual attitudes remains uncertain. The same is true of the interaction effect whereby the literature suggests that heterosexuals tend to be more negative toward homosexuals of their own sex and males tend to hold more negative attitudes than females. However, Kite (1984) concluded that the

studies in this area suffered from problems that serve to render such findings inconclusive.⁸

The major criticism that has been levelled at this research has been the failure to study attitudes of heterosexuals toward gay males *and* lesbians. That is, on many of the attitude measures and questionnaires, the sex of the homosexual target has been unspecified therefore making the examination of the interaction effect impossible. The present investigation made allowances for this (by specifying homosexual target sex on each Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals scale) so that male and female heterosexual attitudes toward gay males and lesbians could be assessed. The objective was that by doing this the results gained would be clearer and more credible.

Bisexuals were excluded from the sample because of their suspected confounding effects. This has been a problem in the research also, whereby results have been biased due to the use of bisexuals as part of the homosexual sample.

The homosexual and heterosexual samples were matched on several factors and this was a necessary part of the present investigation as it catered for a potential confounding factor in the form of relationship length. Very few studies made allowances for this most important factor which can have a major impact on the quality of a relationship (McWhirter and Mattison, 1984). By matching the homosexual and heterosexual samples in this way results on the liking and loving scales could not be readily attributed to length of time in a relationship or subsequent stage of relationship development.

⁸ Kite (1984) cites problems such as the use of poorly designed attitude measures, the tendency for researchers to focus only on males, and the way in which some authors have used both female and male subjects but have failed to report information on sex differences and/or interaction effects.

In conclusion to this it must also be noted that research such as this is long overdue. A relatively extensive search of New Zealand resource materials failed to find any similar research in this area. Therefore, this study was also an attempt to recreate research that has been conducted elsewhere in an effort to see if similar results would be gained from this society.

6. HYPOTHESES

1) That there will be no variation in liking and loving scores regardless of sex (male or female) or sexual orientation (homosexual or heterosexual).

2a) That sex differences will be observed in male and female scores on the Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals Scale, whereby males will be significantly more negative in their attitudes.

2b) In addition to this it is hypothesised that an interaction effect will be observed whereby heterosexuals will be more negative in attitudes toward homosexuals of their own sex.

3) That there will be a positive correlation between heterosexual scores on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and on the Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals Scale.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

7. SUBJECTS

A total of 100 subjects participated in the study, and were drawn from various sources. The homosexual sample consisted of 50 subjects (27 males and 23 females), some of whom were recruited from the Gay University Students Society (G.U.S.S.) and the rest from the Lambda Cafe, (The Peterborough Centre, Christchurch). The heterosexual sample was gained from students in stage one and two Psychology laboratories at the University of Canterbury. Of these 27 were male and 23 were female. All subjects were volunteers.

8. SETTINGS AND PERSONNEL

The homosexual research questionnaires (Appendix 1) were administered, by the author and an assistant, at a function held by the gay university students at the University of Canterbury Student Association. The additional homosexual questionnaires were filled out by customers at the Lambda Cafe; a cafe and casual counselling centre run by homosexuals for homosexuals. The heterosexual research questionnaires (Appendix 11) were distributed to the students during normal class hours in the first and second year student laboratories.

9. MATERIALS

9.1. The Research Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were devised for the purposes of this study; one for homosexual, and the other for heterosexual respondents. The homosexual questionnaire (Appendix 1) consisted of Rubin's (1973) liking and loving

scales and four general questions about relationships. The heterosexual questionnaire (Appendix 11) also contained these but included The Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals Scale (Larsen, Reed and Hoffman 1980) and The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1973).

9.2. Liking and loving scales: Rubin (1973)

Rubin's (1973) liking and loving scales (Appendix 1) consist of two thirteen-item scales that assess the degree of liking and loving that one feels for one's partner. The love scale assesses feelings of attachment, caring and intimacy for one's partner, whereas the liking scale is a measure of respect and affection for one's partner. The content of the love scale represents three major components of romantic love; i) affiliative and dependent need, ii) predisposition to help and iii) exclusiveness and absorption. The liking scale has two major components; i) favourable evaluation and respect for partner and ii) perceived similarity between self and partner.

The love scale has high internal consistency, coefficient alpha =.84 (females) and =.86 (males). It is moderately correlated with the like scale, $r=.39$ (females) and $r=.60$ (males). In order to establish discriminant validity the love scale was developed in conjunction with the like scale. The objective was to develop two conceptually distinct scales that would be only moderately correlated in practice, and the above statistics lend support to the achievement of this aim.

Responses were made on a five-point Likert response format, and were then aggregated to produce two scores between 13 and 65 for each respondent. A lower score on either scale was indicative of greater feeling for one's partner. No problems with reliability, validity or comprehension were anticipated with the use of either of these scales.

9.3. General Questions

In addition to the above scales four questions were asked of both the homosexual and heterosexual respondents, in an effort to gain some information on general opinions of homosexual relationships (Appendix 1). The first two questions were initially designed to examine whether heterosexuals believed homosexual relationship experiences were similar to their own. However, it was then decided that homosexuals should be given the opportunity to comment on whether they believed their own relationships to be similar or different to heterosexual relationships. It was the assumption of the first hypothesis that the two will be more similar than different but this could be rather presumptuous on the part of the researcher. For this reason these questions were administered to both samples.

The second two questions related to the pervasive stereotype that homosexuals (especially gay males) are promiscuous and hence incapable of long term relationships despite research evidence to the contrary⁹. Heterosexual responses to these questions should indicate how pervasive this stereotype is (at least with respect to students) and some indication of the actual capability of homosexuals to have long relationships should be gained from homosexual responses.

9.4. Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals scale: (Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980)

The heterosexual version of the questionnaire also contained the Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals scale (HATH) (Appendix 11). This is a twenty item scale arranged in a five point Likert format measuring a range of

⁹ For example, Bell and Weinberg, 1975; Jay and Young, 1977; Peplau and Cochran, 1981; and Spada, 1979 all found that the majority of their subjects were in steady relationships.

attitudes toward homosexuality. The item total correlations of this scale range from .57 to .74 with a corrected split half correlation of .92. Overall consistency alpha coefficient=.95 and validity and reliability data indicate high reliability and promising construct validity. Those items phrased in a nonhomosexist manner¹⁰ were assigned values of one to five (*strongly agree* =1, *moderately agree* =2, *neutral* =3, *moderately disagree* =4, and *strongly disagree* =5). For those items phrased in a homosexist manner¹¹ the response categories were scored in reverse order (*strongly agree* =5 to *strongly disagree* =1).

A subject's total score was equal to the sum of the numerical value of responses to all items. Therefore scores ranged from 20 to 100; the higher the score the more homosexist the individual, the lower the score the less homosexist. Again, no problems of validity or comprehension were anticipated in applying this scale to the sample.

Each questionnaire contained two HATH scales; one which instructed subjects to respond with male homosexuals in mind and the other with female homosexuals in mind¹². The two sets of instructions were interchanged (half the questionnaires had male instructions first and the other half had female instructions first) to counteract order effects.

The two scales were administered so as to gain information about sex differences and interaction effects with respect to attitudes toward homosexuals. In order that the second scale (repeated measure) did not occur immediately after the first, four general questions and the Attitudes Toward

¹⁰ Items 1,2,7,8,9,10,11,12,16,19

¹¹ Items 3,4,5,6,13,14,15,17,18,20

¹² It is important to clearly distinguish between male and female homosexuals because as Herek (1984) noted, if you simply use the term homosexual the majority will think only of males.

Women scale (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1973) were placed between the two versions of the HATH scale. These two scales were renamed HATH-F and HATH-M in order that they may be more easily distinguishable. HATH-F referred to those questionnaires that were responded to with female target homosexuals in mind whereas HATH-M was the scale that was completed with male target homosexuals in mind.

9.5. Attitudes Toward Women scale: (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1973)

The third scale on the heterosexual questionnaire was the Attitudes Toward Women scale (AWS) (Appendix 11). This widely used scale contained statements about the rights and roles of women in areas such as; vocational, educational, and intellectual activities, sexual and dating behaviour, marital relations and etiquette.

The short form of this scale was used in this study¹³. The AWS was used to assess the extent to which heterosexual respondents adhered to traditional sex role stereotypes. Level of agreement with each item was once again rated on a five-point Likert response format. Those items phrased in an egalitarian manner¹⁴ were assigned values of one to five (*strongly agree* =1 to *strongly disagree* =5). For those items phrased in a nonegalitarian manner¹⁵ the response categories were scored in reverse (*strongly agree* =5 to *strongly disagree* =1). Therefore the higher the score the more sex role traditional the subject was and the lower the score the less sex role traditional.

¹³ Correlations between scores on the short (25 item) and full (55 item) versions were =.95. (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1973.)

¹⁴ Items 2,3,6,7,8,9,11,12,18,21,24,25.

¹⁵ Items 1,4,5,10,13,14,15,16,17,19,20,22,23.

It was assumed for the purposes of this study that there would be negligible problems of comprehension, reliability or validity with any of the scale items on this questionnaire.

10. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

All respondents were required to fill in information regarding, age, sex, sexual orientation, relationship status, and length of time together in current or most important relationship. The questionnaire was administered to males and females of both groups (homosexual and heterosexual) regardless of whether they were in a relationship at the time or not. The instructions preceding the liking and loving scales required each individual to respond with his/her ideal, most significant or most recent romantic relationship in mind.

Individuals, as opposed to couples, were the unit of analysis in this study because generalised values and attitudes, rather than factors related to dyadic interaction, were of interest.

Respondents could be married, non-married, cohabitating, single, or living apart. As Bell and Weinberg (1975) pointed out it is not good to compare two atypical relationships such as unmarried heterosexuals, and homosexuals.

10.1. Sexual orientation

Each respondent was required to rate him or herself on a seven point Kinsey scale (Appendix 1) which measured the degree to which that person was homosexual or heterosexual in his or her feelings and behaviours.

Homosexuality-heterosexuality is not a simple dichotomy as most homosexuals have had some heterosexual contact in the past (Bell and Weinberg 1975). The same may be true for heterosexuals, but perhaps not to

the same extent. Those who rated themselves as, five, six and seven on the Kinsey scale (mainly homosexual with a substantial degree of heterosexuality, mainly homosexual, and exclusively homosexual) were included in the homosexual sample as to gain a sample of exclusively homosexual individuals would have been a very difficult task indeed. Only those who rated themselves as one or two on the Kinsey scale (exclusively and mainly heterosexual) were included in the heterosexual sample. Those who rated themselves as three or four were excluded as they were considered to be bisexual in orientation, and their inclusion in homosexual samples has been questioned due to suspected confounding effects (La Torre and Wendenberg, 1983; MacDonald, 1983).

10.2. Matched Samples

The homosexual and heterosexual samples were matched on age, sex and relationship length. As length of time together may be an important factor in the depth of liking and loving felt for partner the samples were matched on this aspect. (Relationships undergo different stages of development and feelings for one's partner change as a consequence; McWhirter and Mattison, 1984). Matching the homosexual and heterosexual samples in this respect meant that any differences found in liking and loving were not so readily attributable to differences in relationship length.

Matching criteria were strict in that an exact match was found wherever possible but relaxed slightly if that exact match could not be found. Some limitations were imposed due to the difficulty of obtaining a homosexual sample. The heterosexual questionnaire was initially administered to a total of 100 students so that the correct matchings could be made. Once this was achieved the excess completed questionnaires were discarded.

11. PROCEDURE

All subjects were requested to complete the questionnaire honestly and independently. Complete confidentiality of responses was guaranteed and subjects were assured that they need not include their name anywhere on the questionnaire. A brief description of the major objectives of the study was included on the front cover of each questionnaire so respondents were well aware of the general nature of the questionnaire prior to filling it out.

It was assumed that the student sample would consist of heterosexuals, however instructions were included in the heterosexual questionnaire in the unlikely, but not impossible, event that some members of the student sample were homosexual (Appendix 11). Only the homosexual form of the questionnaire was administered at G.U.S.S and Lambda because of the homosexual nature of the centres and it was made clear that the researcher was looking for homosexual respondents in these centres.

At the end of each questionnaire there was an Appendix which gave a more extensive description of the categories on the Kinsey scale of sexual orientation. This was included so that each respondent would be aware of the important distinctions between each category.

During administration of the questionnaire to the heterosexual sample, the researcher placed emphasis upon: a) The importance of responding with the first answer that came to mind and b) the fact that two of the scales were identical but had different instructions. It was further stressed that these two scales were to be answered separately without referral back to previous responses.

A number of questionnaires (the homosexual version) were left for a week at the Lambda cafe for people to fill out. A locked box, for completed forms,

was supplied. A covering letter was included on these questionnaires which explained the nature of the study and gave the name and contact phone number of the researcher. This was so the researcher could be contacted if there were any questions regarding the questionnaire. During administration of all other questionnaires the researcher was present and hence available to answer any queries.

12. RESEARCH DESIGN

12.1. Condition 1

A 2 X 2 factorial design with an average of 25 subjects in each cell was used. The independent variables were sex (male or female) and sexual orientation (homosexual or heterosexual). The dependent variable was scores on the liking and loving scales (Rubin, 1973). Therefore four treatment combinations were obtained by pairing the two independent variables. In this way comparisons could be made among two levels of sex and two levels of sexual orientation (that is, gay males, lesbians, heterosexual males, and heterosexual females).

12.2. Condition 2

This section employed a within subjects factorial design (repeated measures) whereby the same subjects were represented in more than one of the same treatment conditions. That is, each heterosexual respondent was required to fill out the HATH scale twice, but under different conditions (or instructions). A within subjects factorial design was implemented so both main and interaction effects could be obtained. Therefore there was one dependent variable (HATH) with two levels (HATH-F and HATH-M) and one independent variable (SEX) with two levels (male and female).

12.3. Condition 3

The independent variable in this section was SEX (heterosexual male or female) and the dependent variable was scores on the AWS (Spence, Helmreich and Stapp, 1973). This section involved a single factor design whereby the effect of the independent variable on the AWS scores was studied.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

13. THE SAMPLE

After matching the homosexual and heterosexual samples all of the subjects fell into the first three age brackets and therefore ranged from the late teens to forty years of age (see Appendix V1, Table 12). The majority of respondents were single (51%) or in a relationship (34%). One was married, three were divorced and the rest were in defacto relationships (see Appendix V1, Table 13). 51 percent of the sample had been involved in a relationship for a year or less, 26 percent reported being in a relationship for between one and three years. Fifteen percent said they had not had a relationship and the remaining few reported being in their relationships for up to thirteen years (see Appendix V1, Table 14). The majority of respondents were either exclusively homosexual or exclusively heterosexual in their self reported sexual orientation (40% and 48% respectively). Eight percent were mainly homosexual, two percent were mainly heterosexual, while the remaining two percent described themselves as mainly homosexual but with a substantial degree of heterosexuality (see Appendix V1, Table 15).

14. LIKING AND LOVING

All statistics were calculated on the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X). Results showed that there were no significant differences between the means of the four groups (GROUP 1=gay males, GROUP 2=lesbians, GROUP 3=male heterosexuals and GROUP 4=female heterosexuals) on either the liking or the loving scale. A separate oneway analysis of variance (Anova) was carried out on each of the variables (liking and loving) so that each group could be compared on these two dependent variables. The Anova of like scores by group was non significant [$F, (3,93) = .4789, p < .6977$] as were the results concerning love scores by groups [$F, (3,96) = 1.3633, p < .2587$].

Mean scores from each group (See Tables 1 and 2) indicate there was only a small degree of variation in terms of response on the two scales. For example, male homosexuals had the highest like and lowest love scores for partner overall (30.48 and 27.52 respectively). Male heterosexuals had the next highest like score (29.77) and the second highest love score (30.44). Female homosexuals had the third highest like score (28.38) and the third highest love score (28.30). Female heterosexuals had the greatest love score (31.43) but the lowest like score (27.74). Therefore female heterosexuals liked their partners the most and loved them the least. Male homosexuals loved their partners the most and liked them the least. Male heterosexuals and female homosexuals fell somewhere in between, with females liking and loving similarly and males showing slightly higher liking than loving overall.

LIKE:	MEAN	S.D	N.
GROUP 1:	30.48	10.19	27
GROUP 2:	28.38	9.32	21
GROUP 3:	29.77	8.31	26
GROUP 4:	27.74	7.79	23
TOTAL:	29.18	8.91	97

TABLE 1: Means and standard deviations of scores on the liking scale and the number of subjects in each group.

LOVE:	MEAN	S.D	N.
GROUP 1:	27.52	7.75	27
GROUP 2:	28.30	8.93	23
GROUP 3:	30.44	7.79	27
GROUP 4:	31.43	6.48	23
TOTAL:	29.39	7.83	100

TABLE 2: Means and standard deviations of scores on the loving scale and the number of subjects in each group.

15. GENERAL QUESTIONS

The results from these four questions are quite difficult to interpret because of the ambiguity of the questions. The majority of subjects tended to disagree with questions one and two (See tables 3 and 4 respectively). More people disagreed that gay males relationships were different to heterosexual relationships (64.6%) than disagreed with the second statement concerning the difference between female homosexual and heterosexual relationships (59.6%). A surprisingly large portion of gay males and females agreed with the statements (9.4% and 7.3% on question one and 8.5% and 12.8% on question two), possible reasons for which will be outlined in the discussion section. A high percentage of male heterosexuals agreed with questions one and two (12.5% and 12.8% respectively) compared with heterosexual female agree responses on questions one and two (6.3% and 6.4%). Therefore, more heterosexual males agreed there was a difference between homosexual and heterosexual relationships than heterosexual females did.

More people on the whole agreed that female homosexual love is different to heterosexual love (40.4%) than agreed that male homosexual love is different to heterosexual love (35.4%). This could be accounted for by the large

number of lesbians who agreed with this question (12.8%) and the high number of heterosexual males (12.8%).

Questions three and four dealt (see Tables 5 and 6 respectively) with the capability of male and female homosexuals of having enduring love relationships with the same sex partner. 92.8 percent agreed that gay males could have such relationships, and not surprisingly the majority of positive responses to this question came from gay males (25.8%). Interestingly the next most positive group in response to this question was the heterosexual males (24.7%), then heterosexual females (21.6%) and lastly homosexual females (20.6%). Only 7.2 percent of all respondents answered no to this question. On question four 95.9 percent agreed that female homosexuals could have long term relationships with their partners, with the majority of agreement coming from heterosexual males (26.8%) and the smallest level of agreement coming from homosexual females (21.6%). Only 4.1% did not believe lesbians to be capable of such relationships, 2.1% of which can be attributed to gay males and the other 2% accounted for equally by heterosexual males and females.

	GP 1	GP 2	GP 3	GP 4	ROW TOT.
AGREE	9	7	12	6	34
	9.4%	7.3%	12.5%	6.3%	35.4%
DISAGREE	18	12	15	17	62
	18.8%	12.5%	15.6%	17.7%	64.6%

TABLE 3: Raw scores and percentages on the first general question.

	GP 1	GP 2	GP 3	GP 4	ROW TOT.
AGREE	8	12	12	6	38
	8.5%	12.8%	12.8%	6.4%	40.4%
DISAGREE	15	9	15	7	56
	16.0%	9.6%	16%	18.1%	59.6%

TABLE 4: Raw scores and percentages on the second general question.

	GP 1	GP 2	GP 3	GP 4	ROW TOT.
AGREE	25	20	24	21	90
	25.8%	20.6%	24.7%	21.6%	92.8%
DISAGREE	2		3	2	7
	2.1%		3.1%	2.1%	7.2%

TABLE 5: Raw scores and percentages on the third general question.

	GP 1	GP 2	GP 3	GP 4	ROW TOT.
AGREE	24	21	26	22	93
	24.7%	21.6%	26.8%	22.7%	95.9%
DISAGREE	2		1	1	4
	2.1%		1.0%	1.0%	4.1%

TABLE 6: Raw scores and percentages on the fourth general question.

16. HETEROSEXUAL ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALS

Separate t-tests were carried out on HATH-M and HATH-F scores for male and female respondents to determine if the mean performance of these two groups was significantly different. A significant difference was found between male and female scores on the HATH-M [$t(47) = 3.70$ $p < .01$], an indication of the fact that males were significantly more rejecting of male homosexuals than were females. The mean for males was 48.69 and the standard deviation was equal to 16.97 whereas females had a mean of 33.26 and a standard deviation of 11.23 (see Table 7). A significant sex difference was also found on HATH-F

scale [$t(48) = 3.21$ $p < .01$]. The male mean was 48.18 and the standard deviation was 16.55 whereas the female mean was 34.74 and the standard deviation was equal to 12.30, (see Table 8) so it seems that males were also significantly more rejecting of female homosexuals. Therefore it can be concluded that males were found to be significantly more rejecting of both male and female homosexuals than females were, in terms of scores on the HATH scale. In light of this the first part of the second hypothesis can be accepted.

HATH-M:	MEAN	S.D	N
<hr/>			
GROUP 3:	48.69	16.97	26
GROUP 4:	33.26	11.23	23
TOTAL:	41.45	16.38	49

TABLE 7: Means and standard deviations of scores on the male homosexual target HATH scale, and the number of subjects in each group.

HATH-F:	MEAN	S.D	N
<hr/>			
GROUP 3:	48.18	16.55	27
GROUP 4:	34.74	12.30	23
TOTAL:	42.00	16.1	50

TABLE 8: Means and standard deviations of scores on the female homosexual target HATH scale, and the number of subjects in each group.

17. THE TWO ATTITUDE MEASURES: (HATH AND AWS)

A Pearson's product moment correlation was employed to assess the difference, if any, between the scores on the two attitude measures, HATH and AWS. This yielded a coefficient $r = .7524$, $p = .0000$ (47), therefore a highly significant result. Of course, causality or direction of this relationship cannot

be ascertained from this, however given the high positive nature of this coefficient the third hypothesis can be accepted. That is, there appears to be a strong relationship between attitudes toward women and attitudes toward homosexuals.

As can be seen by the results on Table 9, males were more sex role traditional than females were in terms of mean responses on the AWS. The mean response score from male heterosexuals on this scale was 48.8 whereas the female mean was 34.42.

AWS:	MEAN	S.D	N.
GROUP 3:	48.8	12.15	26
GROUP 4:	34.42	6.48	22
TOTAL:	37.83	10.39	48

TABLE 9: Means and standard deviations from heterosexual male and female responses on the AWS, and the number of subjects in each group.

18. MANOVA

A multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted due to the existence of one within factor or dependent variable with two levels (HATH-M and HATH-F) and one grouping factor or independent variable with two levels (SEX; male and female heterosexuals). The Manova was used to determine the effect of sex (male and female heterosexuals) and the repeated measures (HATH-M, male homosexual target and HATH-F, female homosexual target) on attitudes toward homosexuals. Analysis of subjects' responses on the two versions of the attitude scales revealed a significant main effect for sex [$F(1,47) = 12.89, p < .01$]. In the case of sex, males had the greater mean on both HATH-M and HATH-F (48.69 and 48.18 respectively). Females had the lower mean in both cases (33.26 and 34.74) and hence were

more positive in their attitudes toward both male and female homosexuals than were males.

Less encouraging effects were found with respect to the interaction effect [$F(1,47) = .75, p < .390$]-clearly a non significant finding. Therefore the first part of hypothesis two can be accepted but the second part cannot.

19. GENERAL STATISTICS

Mean scores, from the entire sample (see Table 10), on the two attitude measures were relatively low, indicating that attitudes on the whole were quite favourable. For example, the mean on HATH-M was 41.45 and on HATH-F the mean was equal to 42.0. These results signify relatively non-homosexist responses especially when one considers the minimum and maximum scores on HATH-M were 20 and 95 and on HATH-F were 20 and 96.

Similarly, on the AWS the mean from the total sample was 37.83 with the minimum score being 25 and the maximum 78. Therefore this sample was also rather non sexist in its self reported attitudes.

VARIABLE	LIKE	LOVE	HATH-M	HATH-F	AWS
MEAN	29.19	29.39	41.45	42.0	37.83
STD. DEV.	8.91	7.83	16.38	16.1	10.39
MINIMUM	13.0	15.0	20.0	20.0	25.0
MAXIMUM	51.0	51.0	95.0	96.0	78.0
VALID N	97.0	100.0	49.0	50.0	48.0
S.E MEAN	0.905	0.783	2.34	2.28	1.5
VARIANCE	79.36	61.27	268.37	259.22	107.92
RANGE	38	36	75	76	53

TABLE 10: Descriptive statistics from responses of the total sample to each scale.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The present investigation was designed to assess the relative depth and likelihood of liking and loving for the partners of gay males, lesbians, and heterosexual males and females. Comparisons were made between the four groups on Rubins's (1973) liking and loving scales. Variance in attitudes was also studied with respect to sex of respondent, sex of homosexual target and acceptance of commonly held sex role stereotypes for males and females. In the following, the outcome for each hypothesis and the implications of the findings have been discussed and then possible explanations for the findings have been proposed.

20. LIKING AND LOVING

In this case the absence of a significant difference between the four groups was exactly what was required to support the first hypothesis, and show that male and female homosexuals and heterosexuals are more similar than different in their relationship experiences. Results from this section of the study were therefore consistent with the first hypothesis, and with the findings of others who have employed similar techniques (Peplau, 1981; Kurdek, 1986b; Kurdek and Schmitt, 1986; Peplau and Cochran, 1980; Schullo and Alperson, 1984; Duffy and Rusbult, 1986).

Rubin's (1973) scales have been widely used either alone or in conjunction with other measures such as relationship satisfaction (Kurdek, 1986a), stage of relationship development, (Kurdek and Schmitt, 1986b; Kurdek, 1989) and psychological adjustment (Kurdek and Schmitt, 1986). Psychometrically these scales appear to be sound and consistently yield strikingly similar results, hence implying good reliability.

To compare social groups on such integral relationship dynamics as loving and liking of partner on the basis of these two thirteen-item scales may seem a little simplistic. Despite this, it is a good place to start to show the lack of difference that actually exists between homosexuals and heterosexuals on these factors. As this finding appears to be rather consistent in the literature perhaps the time has come to publicise this knowledge so that the general population can absorb the information and possibly, in this way, become more aware. With greater awareness may come a more enlightened outlook.

The question remains as to why some individuals believe there is a difference between homosexuals and heterosexuals, in terms of relationship experiences, regardless of the large amount of empirical evidence that refutes the existence of such a difference¹⁶. This stereotypical belief may simply be an extension of the more general attitude that homosexuals are different from heterosexuals in most respects. That is, people tend to view homosexuals and heterosexuals as different on factors other than just their sexual orientation. In support of this, Karr (1975) found homosexual males were labelled (by heterosexual males) as more feminine, less intellectual and less friendly than heterosexual males. If homosexuals are seen as different on these factors then it is plausible that they may also be viewed as different in terms of what they are capable of experiencing in a relationship.

This perceived difference may also be due to the generally negative attitudes held with respect to homosexuals. That is, homophobic heterosexuals may be unwilling to allow homosexuals credibility in any area, let alone that of relationships, the very manifestation of an individual's homosexuality.

¹⁶ Even in the present study, where results showed the sample to be reasonably nonhomosexist, a relatively large number of heterosexuals agreed that male and female homosexuals had different relationships to their own. 12.5% of the males and 6.3% of the females said gay male relationships differed. 12.8% and 6.4% of males and females respectively, said lesbian relationships differed from their own.

Obviously, homosexual relationships arise from sexual orientation toward a person of the same sex therefore to condone this is to condone the wider sphere of homosexuality. It may therefore be easier to condemn all aspects and view homosexual relationships as unnatural phenomena.

It stands to reason that there may be a proportion of the population who has never even considered the possibility that homosexuals have love relationships, let alone questioned whether homosexuals have similar or different experiences to themselves. It follows that people in this position may report that a difference exists between homosexual and heterosexual relationships simply because they know no better. It is also possible that such individuals have not yet formed strong opinions, so they may be more receptive to new ideas and information than someone who has fixed ideas and opinions about such issues. This line of reasoning highlights the need for early education in the nature of human relationships.

Even the label 'homosexual' places a strong emphasis on the sexual aspect of same-sex relationships and gives no indication of a romantic component. In fact, more recently, the terms 'lesbian' and 'gay male' have been used throughout the research literature instead of 'homosexual'. In the present study a number of respondents changed the term 'homosexual' on the Kinsey scale to 'gay male' or 'lesbian'. Perhaps even small changes in the terminology used with respect to homosexuals may have some impact on the way in which this social group is perceived.

From this section of this study it can be concluded that there appears to be little variation in liking and loving experiences (as measured by Rubin's scales) due to sex or sexual orientation. It therefore seems that romantic love is experienced similarly by homosexuals and heterosexuals within their respective relationships.

20.1. General Questions

The four general questions were asked in an attempt to gain a very general idea of whether subjects believe a difference exists between homosexual and heterosexual relationships. So often in the research it has been assumed that heterosexuals believe there is a difference and the researcher has set out to disprove this. This may be a reasonable assumption, considering the high levels of homophobia that some studies have yielded. However, at the outset of this study it was not simply assumed that the heterosexual sample would be negative or would believe a relationship difference existed between these two social groups. Consequently, each subject was questioned with respect to two of the more pervasive myths concerning homosexual relationships: the similarity or difference between homosexual and heterosexual love, and promiscuity in homosexual relationships. Homosexuals were also required to respond to these questions as it was considered important to gain their views on these aspects of their own relationships in order that comparisons could be made between homosexual and heterosexual males and females.

As has been seen the results were mixed, perhaps because of the ambiguous nature of the questions. Comments made by homosexuals on the questionnaire (and the unexpectedly high level of agreement from the homosexual sample with the first two statements) made it clear that many were reading the questions differently from what was originally expected. That is, many agreed that homosexual (male and female) relationships were different to heterosexual ones, but the difference was, in fact, a positive one. For example, comments were made to the effect that homosexual relationships were more egalitarian,¹⁷ happier and generally superior to heterosexual relationships.

¹⁷ This was an interesting finding but hardly surprising when one considers that sexual equality is less likely to be an issue in same-sex relationships, where members may have more similar role expectations.

It would have been interesting to discover if these comments were based on beliefs or actual experiences. That is, some homosexuals may have had a degree of heterosexual experience and were therefore making objective comparisons, while others may have just been speculating. Whatever the case may have been this reasoning accounts for the relatively large number of homosexuals who agreed with the statement that homosexual and heterosexual relationships are different.¹⁸

Unfortunately it was unclear how *all* respondents were interpreting the ambiguous questions. As it happens, a surprisingly large portion of the entire sample (homosexual and heterosexual) disagreed with the first two statements, regarding the difference between homosexual and heterosexual relationships. These reasonably non homophobic responses may have been an artifact of the heterosexual sample, which consisted of young, white, middle class students who may have been more educated about homosexuality¹⁹ than the general population, and/or more liberal in their self reported attitudes.

Students may regard themselves as more liberal in their attitudes toward many things, including alternative lifestyles. If this is the case then they may report more liberal attitudes toward homosexuals in keeping with this self image.²⁰

¹⁸ 9.4% of gay males and 7.3% of lesbians agreed that gay male relationships are different, whereas 8.5% and 12.8%, of the same groups, agreed that female homosexual relationships are different from heterosexual relationships.

¹⁹ There is evidence to suggest that educating individuals about homosexuality can have a dramatic and positive effect on attitudes. In support of this Morin and Van Shaik (1975) found that attitudes could be changed in a positive or negative direction by as little as one article, depending on the content of that article. Morin (1974) also reported that attitudes could be easily influenced by a single course on human sexuality offered to graduate and undergraduate students in psychology.

²⁰ This is an extension of the third attitude type referred to by Herek (1984) as 'symbolic attitudes' in his theoretical framework of attitudes. This framework has been outlined in the introduction.

More optimistically, these findings may be a reflection of the times; people may be becoming more favourable and enlightened in their attitudes toward homosexuality. The answer to this of course can not be fully realised until a similar study on attitudes is done using a non student sample. Only in this way can the attitudes of the entire population be gauged and comparisons be made between the attitudes of students and those of society at large. In this way some indication will be gained of whether the results from the student sample can be generalised to cover the entire population.

As for the questions relating to whether gay males are capable of an enduring romantic relationship, a majority of the total sample agreed with this (92.8%), whereas slightly fewer (95.9%) agreed that female homosexuals were capable of this. Therefore, the majority of respondents were certain that homosexuals could have long term relationships, regardless of how similar or different they believed these relationships to be from heterosexual relationships. This finding was unexpected in that respondents were divided as to how similar or different homosexual and heterosexual relationships are, yet were almost unanimous in their agreement that male and female homosexuals are capable of long term relationships. It appears from these results that heterosexuals agreed that homosexuals can have long term relationships, however many seemed to think the make-up of these relationships is somehow different to their own. It may even be possible that such individuals believe homosexual relationships do not involve an element of romantic love, but this assertion can only be supported by further research.

The smallest level of agreement came from homosexual females (21.6%) but a closer look revealed that lesbians were the smallest group of respondents, and were actually unanimous in their positive response to this question. Interestingly, not all gay males agreed that male homosexuals could have long term relationships (2.1% disagreed with question three). Once again it was

unclear whether these respondents were being objective or merely speculating.

Such results indicate that the myth of homosexuals being sexually promiscuous and incapable of long term relationships may in fact be diminishing, at least with respect to the sample in this study. That is not to say that these results can as yet be generalised to the whole population.

It therefore appears to have been a worthwhile venture to ask these questions of both groups, as they not only showed an unexpectedly high level of acceptance of homosexuals in these two areas but also brought to light the way that some homosexuals tend to view their own relationships, that is: as somewhat better than heterosexual ones.

21. ATTITUDES

In the second section of this study, hostility in attitudes toward homosexuals was studied and the variables examined in relation to this were sex of the heterosexual respondent and sex of the homosexual target. Results showed a significant main effect for sex, from which we can conclude that there was a significant gender difference in attitudes toward homosexuals on both the HATH-M and HATH-F scales. A closer look at the means on the two scales revealed males to be more rejecting of male and female homosexuals.

This significant gender difference on HATH scores is in accordance with a large amount of empirical evidence which suggests that males are significantly more rejecting of homosexuals than are females (eg; Brown and Amoroso, 1975; Hansen, 1982a; Herek, 1984; Kite, 1984; Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980; Millham and Weinberger, 1979; Weis and Dain, 1982).

Historically, people have tried to account for sex differences in attitudes by such things as, defense against affection for same sex persons (Ferenzci, 1914, 1956), and innate repulsion for same sex persons (James, 1890).

More recently, Larsen, Reed and Hoffman(1980) made the assertion that rejection of homosexuality was part and parcel of the greater rejection of minorities. From this it could be hypothesised that lesbians would suffer the greatest rejection as they can lay claim to belonging to two minority groups in society, that is, homosexuals and women. The results of the present study showed that this was not the case as male and female homosexuals were almost equally rejected, however, to extrapolate from this, it could also be suggested that women are more sympathetic because of their enlightened awareness of the plight of a minority group and are therefore more understanding. This may be one reason for the sex difference that tends to exist in attitudes toward homosexuality.

MacDonald and Games (1974) have proposed ignorance as a reason for hostility toward homosexuals, which becomes problematic when one attempts to apply this to the existence of attitudinal sex differences. That is, if one is not careful one inevitably ends up suggesting males are more ignorant than females. Ignorance may also be related to lack of knowledge about or contact with homosexuals but to argue convincingly about the likelihood of males being more ignorant in this sense also creates problems. Attempting to apply these lines of reasoning to sex differences in attitudes makes it clear that hostility toward homosexuals runs deeper than just ignorance about, or lack of contact with, homosexuals. That is not to say that these factors do not play a part as there is evidence to suggest that ignorance about homosexuality breeds contempt (Hansen, 1982a; Millham, San Miguel and Kellogg, 1976; and Weis and Dain, 1979). Moreover, there is a very promising branch of research (Morin, 1977; and Morin and Garfinkle, 1978) that strongly suggests that

even small amounts of information about homosexuals can influence attitudes toward this group in a positive direction.

Obviously the reason for sex differences in attitudes is still uncertain but there seem to be a number of contributing factors. For example, the different socialisation experiences of males and females may play an important part. That is, from early on male and female children are expected to act in a manner consistent with their anatomical sex, and generally learn to do just that. As Karr (1975) noted, homosexuals were viewed by heterosexual males as generally having more feminine qualities and were rated as more womanly, softer, smaller and more delicate. From this it may be suggested that male heterosexuals condemn homosexuals in order to prove their heterosexuality and make every effort to behave in the culturally prescribed manner for their sex so as not to be seen as having feminine traits. Females on the other hand may not feel the same sort of pressure to assert their femininity as some males may feel to assert their masculinity.

Alternatively, it may be that lesbianism is not as incongruent with the female sex role as male homosexuality is with the male sex role (Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1974). If this is the case then it may follow that male homosexuality is more easily identifiable than lesbianism and the threat of being labelled in such a way is more a reality for males than females. Greater sense of threat may therefore lead to greater fear and rejection of homosexuality by males than females.

Machismo and masculinity may make up a large part of the male psyche for some and projecting this image may be important to many (this may involve asserting one's masculinity, virility etc). Homosexuals have often been viewed as less masculine and as sexual failures (with the opposite sex) and this may account, to some extent, for why homosexuals have been so strongly rejected and treated as an outgroup in society, especially by heterosexual males. That

is, the rejection is an expression of male heterosexual dislike for these characteristics (seen to be typical of homosexuals) and an attempt to prove their own heterosexuality and hence avoid such labels. This may account for why males are more negative toward gay males but gives little indication of why they also show greater rejection (than females) of lesbians also. Perhaps this finding is a reflection of the times in that some individuals may now be more negative toward lesbians because of what they often represent. That is, males and even some females may be negative toward lesbians not only because of their sexual orientation but also because of the feminist ideals they tend to espouse.

It is more than likely that there is a substantial amount of peer group pressure involved in anti-gay sentiment. For example, in order not to be seen as accepting homosexuality, heterosexuals may reduce the risk of being identified with this group by expressing negative attitudes consistent with the expectations of their peers or consistent with what their peers actually do express. Research has tended to support the assertion (Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980; Herek, 1984b), that if one sees one's peers as antihomosexual this may in turn increase one's own likelihood of expressing antihomosexual sentiment. Once again it is difficult to apply this line of reasoning to attitudinal sex differences but it seems evident that peer group pressure would be a major contributing factor in the general hostility toward homosexuals. Daring to be different from the crowd on any issue can be difficult, but daring to express alternative opinions on an issue as sensitive as homosexuality may prove impossible for some. An interesting area for future research would be an examination of whether males are more influenced by peer group pressure. If such research showed this to be true then it would add weight to the suggestion that peer group pressure plays a part in the greater rejection of homosexuals by heterosexual males.

Some individuals may be afraid that by associating with homosexuals they may be labelled as a homosexual themselves, therefore to avoid such identification they may make every effort to avoid being seen with homosexuals or at the places such individuals go. Because lesbianism has been seen as more of a support network for women in the past (Ward and Kassenbaum, 1965), this may not be such an issue for female heterosexuals as they may be less afraid of being labelled as a homosexual if seen with members of this social group. Males on the other hand may be far more threatened by this type of labelling and therefore make no effort to allow any sort of intimacy or friendship develop between themselves and gay males. Female homosexuality has also been seen as less problematic in terms of health issues (Ward and Kassenbaum, 1965) and once again this may be more relevant in today's society with the spread of AIDS. That is, homosexuals have been held responsible by many for the onset and spread of this virus and gay males more so than lesbians. Perhaps heterosexual males are more afraid of catching this virus if they associate too closely with gay males. Although this fear is irrational it may play an important role in the differential rejection of homosexuals by male and female heterosexuals.

This type of attitude serves only to keep these social groups separate and perpetuates the ignorance that so often leads to hostility and prejudice. This type of segregation must be broken down and a more integrated approach must take its place if any improvement is to be effected in attitudes toward homosexuals.

21.1. The Interaction Effect

Results from the analysis on the interaction effect were disappointing in their non significance. Consequently, the hypothesis that heterosexual males are more negative in attitudes toward male homosexuals, and female heterosexuals are significantly more rejecting of female homosexuals, was not supported.

Mixed results have been found with respect to the interaction effect. Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier 1974, Millham, San Miguel, and Kellogg 1976, Millham and Weinberger (1977) are some who have found such an effect, but Herek (1984) and Morin and Garfinkle (1978) found males were more negative toward homosexuals regardless of sex of the homosexual target. Kite (1984) called for caution with respect to interpretation of these results because although she found a slight interaction effect (from a meta-analysis of all relevant research), the number of studies dealing with this issue was small, and they suffered from a number of methodological problems.

One reason for the failure to find such an effect in the present study may have been the way in which the two attitude scales were administered. Both scales were included in the same questionnaire but had differing instructions. It is entirely possible that a learning effect came into play when the questionnaires were being answered, whereby the time between the two may not have been great enough. Consequently, subjects may have been able to remember how they had answered on the first scale and hence repeated something similar on the second. Measures were taken to reduce the likelihood of this occurrence by placing the two scales as far apart as possible within the questionnaire, and requesting each respondent to answer the questions with the first thing that came to mind and not to refer back to the previous scale. Better results may have been gained by administering the two scales, to the same group of subjects, after a time lapse of a few weeks.

Therefore, although no significant interaction effect was gained in this study it was possibly due to the proximity of the two scales on the questionnaire (and the subsequent learning effect), rather than to the lack of such an interaction effect. That is, intuitively it makes sense that male and female heterosexuals are more hostile toward homosexual members of their own sex. In addition to this it is a reasonably well supported theory in terms of the research evidence, and there have been a number of convincing ideas forwarded to account for its existence. For example, it has been suggested that heterosexuals are afraid of homosexuals of their own sex as these homosexuals are more of a threat to their own sexual identity (MacDonald, 1976; Weinberg, 1972). This theory assumes that heterosexuals fear their own latent homosexuality and espouse strong negative attitudes toward homosexuals in order to substantiate their own heterosexuality and therefore avoid being labelled homosexual.

"The irrational fear of being close to other men and of the label "homosexual" has been a long standing dynamic which has kept many men imprisoned in traditional roles." (Morin and Garfinkle, 1978, p.44).

It is also possible that homosexuals may be perceived as potentially dangerous, in the sense that they may be sexually aggressive toward unwilling partners, therefore same sex homosexuals may be more of a threat for this reason also (Morin, 1977). To extend this argument a little further it may be that heterosexuals are especially rejecting of homosexuals of their own sex because they are more repelled by the thought of the sexual act of a homosexual of the same sex as themselves. That is, male and female heterosexuals may have greater difficulty visualising or dealing with what constitutes the sexual act for a homosexual member of the same sex, knowing what is the culturally prescribed sexual manner for a person of that sex. Thinking of the sexual act of a homosexual member of the opposite sex may not be so problematic as it may not be so close to the bone, so to speak.

There may be no reason to reject this non-significant result as it may be that heterosexuals are actually no more rejecting of homosexual members of their own sex. The findings, while being inconsistent with some of the research and the second part of the second experimental hypothesis, may in fact be correct.

One suggestion for the existence of this interaction effect has been that female homosexuality may be more socially acceptable as it has often been viewed as a social support network for females or as a passing phase (Ward and Kassenbaum, 1965). The assertion that lesbianism provides a social support network may be more relevant in contemporary society than ever before, however, it may now lead to more negative reactions toward female homosexuals rather than the more lenient reactions of the past. It seems that radical feminism and lesbianism are becoming increasingly entwined, with women turning to lesbianism because of their political beliefs and not their sexual orientation. During the course of this study one lesbian summed this state of affairs up by saying: "Many lesbians today call themselves lesbians and then *learn* to love women." This may actually have served to increase negative attitudes toward lesbians especially from some of the more staunch male traditionalists. Radical feminists and/or political lesbians tend to be proponents of anti-male sentiment and sexual equality which may serve to make some males more negative. If a woman is seen to be a feminist as well as a lesbian then this person is challenging traditional sex roles on more than one front, and hence may be more disliked by those who still support inequality for the sexes. If this person is also outwardly anti-male this may only serve to increase hostility from the male camp and often also from some of the more traditional females

To forward another possibility it could be suggested, as MacDonald and Games (1974) have, that individuals may simply be afraid of anything that is different. This assertion would appear to go a long way in accounting for the hostility that has so frequently been observed with respect to homosexuals, but

it also seems reasonable to attribute the interaction effect to this factor too. In other words, in the past it may have been possible that individuals are especially rejecting of homosexuals of their own sex because any individual of one's own sex who is perceived as different may be more threatening. However in contemporary society where conformity is not always the rule people may have become more accustomed to alternative lifestyles and attitudes, and hence in this study the interaction effect has not been observed. This of course is subject to enquiry and debate, and may be a good area for future researchers to pursue.

As we have seen, research indicates that if individuals are requested to answer questions and think about homosexuality then the majority will think only of males (Black and Stevenson, 1984). It may follow from this that individuals think of homosexuality as mainly a male phenomenon and because of this male homosexuality may be predominant in their minds when expressing or processing antihomosexual sentiment. People may not think so actively or specifically about females being homosexual therefore when it comes to responding to questions about homosexuality it is males that suffer the greatest rejection. This goes some way in accounting for why an interaction effect has been observed in the past, whereby the differential rejection of homosexuals is only relevant to gay males (Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1975), but not in the present investigation. That is, maybe in today's society, with lesbianism becoming more political, people may be becoming more aware of the fact that the term homosexuality refers to both males and females. In addition to this, in this study subjects were required to respond with both gay males and lesbians in mind and therefore were forced to separate the two, and results showed the sample to be equally rejecting of both sexes. Perhaps therefore hostility is due to dislike of the homosexual sexual orientation per se, and the sex of the homosexual is irrelevant in terms of this rejection.

These lines of reasoning rest on the assumption that males are more negative toward male homosexuals because it has been more of a prevalent issue in society for a number of reasons. Additionally, it appears that *male* homosexuality has always been considered indicative of homosexuality and that females merely had good friendships with other women as part of a social support network. An interaction effect may not have been found in this study because lesbianism may have come more to the fore and people may now be confronted with having to make decisions about male and female homosexuals.

21.2. Attitudes Toward Women and Attitudes Toward Homosexuals

The third hypothesis was conclusively supported by the results in that a high and positive correlation was found between scores on the two attitude measures. This finding was not surprising when one considers, firstly, the proposal of Larsen, Reed and Hoffman (1980) that the rejection of homosexuals is a component of the wider rejection of minority groups in general, or secondly, the assertion and research findings of MacDonald and Games (1974), Minnergerode (1976), Morin and Garfinkle (1978) who found a relationship between belief in traditional ideologies and attitudes toward homosexuals. Furthermore, it is hardly surprising that individuals who hold strong beliefs about traditional male and female roles react negatively to persons, such as homosexuals, who do not adhere to these roles. Sex role traditionalists would be unlikely to react positively to any person (regardless of sexual orientation) who rejected traditional sex roles, let alone homosexuals. Even if one subjectively considers homosexual males and females, gay males are not generally viewed as typically masculine, and females are not usually thought of as feminine (evidenced by the terminology used with respect to these individuals; terms such as butch, pansy, fairy, and queen). These are the characteristics that traditionalists tend to think male and

female roles should consist of, but homosexuals do not usually fit these moulds. Therefore this could be one reason for the rejection of homosexuals by traditionalists.

Herek (1984) would explain this relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes toward homosexuals by referring to the third attitude type outlined in his framework; namely symbolic attitudes. That is, if an individual has strong negative views toward women and/or traditional sex roles Herek (1984) would suggest that person is likely to express similar views about homosexuality in keeping with these conservative views.

Sex role traditionalists are obviously more conservative in their views about male and female roles, which more than likely predisposes conservatism in other areas, such as homosexuality. Such conservatism may be indicative of ignorance and if this is the case then it is quite promising in the sense that progress may be made by better educating such individuals. However, the reasons for hostility may run far deeper than this which creates greater obstacles to the implementation of change.

22. FUTURE RESEARCH AREAS

The existence of both sex differences and negativity in attitudes toward homosexuals seems to be fairly well established in the research, therefore the time has come to take a more active approach and find ways in which these attitudes can be changed. Research is needed into the type of education programmes that will prove most effective in changing people's attitudes. It is also important to discover where and when such programmes can be implemented in order to effect the greatest impact. This type of research would involve issues such as; the best age to begin educating individuals about homosexuality, and the type of information that would be most effective at influencing attitudes.

There is a need for more longitudinal studies to discover if homosexual and heterosexual relationships follow similar patterns of development. At present most studies deal with homosexual relationships that have only lasted a few years. Admittedly, problems may be encountered in locating homosexuals who have been in long term relationships as they may be less a part of the homosexual social community. That is, perhaps when individuals enter a steady relationship the need to socialise in that group becomes less important. However, it is these relationships that will shed new light on the long term dynamics involved in homosexual relationships.

In addition to this is the need to move into new fields of enquiry, such as the reasons for sex differences in attitudes. For example, investigation into whether heterosexual males are more susceptible to peer group pressure than females and hence are more negative toward homosexuals as a consequence would be an interesting area to pursue.

There is also the need for more attitude studies using non-student samples, so it can be established whether the research in this area using student samples can be generalised to the entire population.

23. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There may have been a learning effect that came into play with the repeated measure attitude scale. This could have been corrected by a follow up study in which the second form of the HATH scale would have been administered after a predetermined time.

A greater number of subjects and a non-student heterosexual sample would have been preferable but as the samples in the present study were matched it would have proved difficult to find an equally large number of homosexual subjects.

The use of a student sample facilitated this piece of research but served to create problems with external validity. The use of a hidden population such as homosexuals created similar problems in that the people who volunteered for this research may have been those who were more relaxed about their sexual orientation and/or those who were more satisfied in their relationships.

The problem of self report bias was created by the use of a questionnaire based methodology and this bias may have been enhanced by the sensitive nature of the topic under investigation.

Despite a number of methodological problems which have been described, conclusions can still be drawn from this study.

24. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

What can conclusively be said on the basis of this study is that romantic love is not specific to heterosexuality. Homosexuals and heterosexuals are far more similar than different in terms of what they want from, and experience in, relationships. Therefore it is sexual orientation alone that marks the difference between homosexual and heterosexual relationships; the elements that constitute the two appear to be the same. It can be concluded, from the reasonably high degree of agreement with the four general questions, that some of the traditional beliefs regarding homosexual relationships may be slowly eroding, at least with respect to the sample in the present study.

What is also clear from the findings is that gender is a powerful predictor of subjects' attitudes toward homosexuals, with males being consistently less favourable than females. A number of proposals have been made to try and account for these differences in attitudes but in conclusion it must be said that education appears to be a key factor in effecting a positive shift in these attitudes.

It was discovered that heterosexuals were not especially rejecting of homosexual members of their own sex, which contradicted some of the results that have emerged in previous studies. A number of arguments were forwarded to account for this non-significant finding. It was also suggested that the failure to find this effect may have been due to methodological problems, such as the way in which the scales were administered.

Another clear finding was that attitudes toward women and attitudes toward homosexuals were highly correlated, thus lending support to the suggestion that the rejection of homosexuals is part of the greater rejection of minorities. This also supports the proposal that those who hold more traditional views about sex roles are correspondingly more likely to hold conservative views about homosexuality

In conclusion, it remains to be said that negative attitudes toward homosexuals still exist in contemporary society and appear to be motivated by a variety of factors. For example, one person's negative attitudes may result from the need for acceptance in a social group, another's may be a defense against unconscious conflicts and a third may simply be expressing negative social stereotypes. Therefore, any attempt to effect a positive change in attitudes toward homosexuals must take these factors into account, because it is likely that there are as many ways of influencing attitudes as there are causes for those attitudes.

REFERENCE LIST

- Allgeier, E.R., & McCormick, N.B. (1983) *Changing Boundaries: Gender Roles and Sexual Behaviour*. Mayfield Publishing Company. California. USA.
- Bailey, D.J. (1987) *The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion: Changing Attitudes Toward AIDS Victims and Homosexuals*. Masters Thesis. Canterbury University..
- Bell, A.P. (1975) Research in homosexuality: Back to the drawing board. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 4, (4) 421-431.
- Bell, A.P., & Weinberg, M.S. (1978) *Homosexualities: A study of diversity among men and women*. Simon and Schuster, New York.
- Black, K.N., & Stevenson, M.R. (1984) The relationship of self-reported sex-role characteristics and attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10, (1-2) 83-93.
- Blasband, D., & Peplau, L.A. (1985) Sexual exclusivity versus openness in gay male couples. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 14, (5) 395-412.
- Brown, M., & Amoroso, D.M. (1975) Attitudes toward homosexuality among West Indian male and female college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 97, 163-168.
- Cabaj, R.P. (1988) Gay and lesbian couples: Lessons on human intimacy. *Psychiatric Annals*, 18, (1) 21-23.
- Caldwell, M.A., & Peplau, L.A. (1984) The balance of power in lesbian relationships. *Sex Roles*, 10 (7-8) 587-599.

- Cardell, M., Finn, S., & Maracek, J. (1981) Sex-role identity, sex-role behaviour, and satisfaction in heterosexual, lesbian, and gay male couples. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, (3) 488-494.
- Dailey, D.M. (1979) Adjustment of heterosexual and homosexual couples in pairing relationships: An exploratory study. *Journal of Sex Research*, 15, (2) 143-157.
- Dion, K.L., & Dion, K.K. (1973) Correlates of romantic love. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 41, 51-56.
- Duffy, S.M., & Rusbult, C.E. (1985-1986) Satisfaction and commitment in homosexual and heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 12, (2) 1-23.
- Dunbar, J., Brown, M., & Amoroso, D.M. (1973) Some correlates of attitudes toward homosexuality. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 89, 271-279.
- Dunbar, J., Brown, M., & Vuorinen, S. (1973) Attitudes toward homosexuality among Brazilian and Canadian college students. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 90, 173-183.
- Engel, J.W., & Saracino, M. (1986) Love preferences and ideals: A comparison of homosexual, bisexual, and heterosexual groups. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal*, 8 (3) 241-250.
- Glenn, N.D., & Weaver, C.N. (1979) Attitudes toward premarital, extramarital, and homosexual relations in the U.S. in the 1970's. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 15 (2) 108-118.

- Hansen, G.L. (1982) Measuring prejudice against homosexuality (homosexism) among college students: A new scale. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 117, 233-236.
- Herek, G.M. (1984) Beyond 'homophobia': A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10, (1-2) 1-21
- Herek, G.M. (1984) Attitudes towards lesbians and gay men: A factor-analytic study. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10 (1-2) 39-51.
- Herek, G.M., & Glunt, E.K. (1988) An epidemic of stigma: public reactions to AIDS. *American Psychologist*, 43 (11) 886-891.
- Kinsey, A.C., Pomeroy, W.B., & Martin, C.E. (1948) *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*. Saunders, Philadelphia.
- Kite, M. (1984) Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexuals: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10 (1-2) 69-81.
- Kruelewitz, J.E., & Nash, J.E. (1980) Effects of sex role attitudes and similarity on men's rejection of male homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38 (1) 67-74.
- Kurdek, L.A., & Schmitt, J.P. (1986a) Early development of relationship quality in heterosexual married, heterosexual cohabiting, gay and lesbian couples. *Developmental Psychology*, 22 (3) 305-309.
- Kurdek, L.A., & Schmitt, J.P. (1986b) Relationship quality of partners in heterosexual married, heterosexual cohabiting, and gay and lesbian relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 51 (4) 711-720.

- Laner, M.R. (1977) Permanent partner priorities: Gay and straight. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 3 (1) 21-39.
- Laner, M.R., & Laner, R.H. (1980) Sexual preference or personal style? Why lesbians are disliked. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 5 (4) 339-356.
- Larsen, K.S., Reed, M., & Hoffman, S. (1980) Attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality: A Likert-type scale and construct validity. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 16 (3) 245-257.
- La Torre, R.A., & Wendenburg, K. (1983) Psychological characteristics of bisexual, heterosexual and homosexual women. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 9 87-98.
- Lee, J.A. (1973) *The Colors of Love: An Exploration of the Ways of Loving*. Don Mills, Ontario: New Press (Popular Edition).
- Levitt, E.E., & Klassen, A.D. (1974) Public attitudes toward homosexuality: Part of the 1970 national survey by the Institute for Sex Research. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 1 (1) 29-43.
- MacDonald, A.P., Huggins, J., Young, S., & Swanson, R.A. (1973) Attitudes toward homosexuality: Preservation of sex morality or the double standard? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 40 (1) 161.
- MacDonald, Jnr, A.P. (1983) A little bit of lavender goes a long way: A critique of the research on sexual orientation. *Journal of Sex Research*, 19 (1) 94-100.
- Millham, J., San Miguel, C.L., & Kellogg, R. (1976) A factor analytic conceptualization of attitudes toward male and female homosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 2 (1) 3-10.

- Millham, J., & Weinberger, L.E. (1977) Sexual preference, sex role appropriateness, and restriction of social access. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 2 (4)
- Morin, S.F. (1977) Heterosexual bias in psychological research on lesbianism and male homosexuality. *American Psychologist*, 629-637.
- Morin, S.F., & Garfinkle, E.M. (1978) Male homophobia. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34 (1) 29-47.
- Nevid, J.S. (1983) Exposure to homoerotic stimuli: Effects on attitudes and effects on heterosexual viewers. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 119, 249-255
- Nyberg, K.L., & Alston, J.P. (1976-77) Analysis of public attitudes toward homosexual behaviour. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 2 (2) 99-107.
- Peplau, L.A. (1981) What homosexuals want in relationships. *Psychology Today*, March, 28-38.
- Peplau, L.A. (1983) Research on homosexual couples: An overview. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 8 (2) 3-8.
- Peplau, L.A., Cochran, S., Rook, K., & Padesky, C. (1978) Attachment and autonomy in lesbian relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34, (3) 7-27.
- Rubin, Z. (1970) Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 16 (2) 265-273.
- Rubin, Z. (1973) *Liking and loving: An invitation to social psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

- Schafer, S. (1977) Sociosexual behaviour in male and female homosexuals: A study of sex differences. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 6 (5) 355-363.
- Schullo, S.A., & Alperson, B.L. (1984) Interpersonal phenomenology as a function of sexual orientation, sex, sentiment and trait categories in long-term dyadic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47 (5) 983-1002.
- Smith, K.T. (1971) Homophobia: A tentative personality profile. *Psychological Reports*, 29, 1091-1094.
- Smith, S.G. (1983) A comparison among three measures of social sex-role. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 9 (1) 99-107.
- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973) A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bull. Psychon. Soc. Vol.2(4)*
- Steffensmeier, D., & Steffensmeier, R. (1974) Sex differences in reactions to homosexuals: Research continuities and further developments. *Journal of Sex Research*, 10 (1) 52-67.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1986) A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93, 119-135.
- Storms, M.D. (1978) Attitudes toward homosexuality and femininity in men. *Journal of Homosexuality*.3 257-263.
- Weis, C.B., & Dain, R.N. (1979) Ego development and sex attitudes in heterosexual and homosexual men and women. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 8 (4) 341-356.

Young, M. & Whertvine, J. (1982) Attitudes of heterosexual students toward homosexual behaviour. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 673-674.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bailey, W.C., Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S.S. (1987) Relation of sex and gender roles to love, sexual attitudes and self-esteem. *Sex Roles*, 16, (11-12) 637-648.
- Carrier, J.M. (1977) "Sex-role preference" as an explanatory variable in homosexual behaviour. *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 6 (1) 53-65.
- Dean, R.B. & Richardson, H. (1966) On MMPI high-point codes of homosexual versus heterosexual males. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 30, (6) 558-560.
- Foa, V.G., Anderson, B., Converse, Jnr, J., Urbansky, W.A., & Cawley, J. (1987) Gender related sexual attitudes: some cross cultural similarities and differences. *Sex Roles*, 16 (9-10) 511-519.
- Haist, M., & Hewitt, J. (1974) The butch-fem dichotomy in male homosexual behaviour. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 10 (1) 68-75.
- Hendrick, C. & Hendrick, S. (1986) A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50 (2) 392-402.
- Hendrick, S., Hendrick, C., Slapion-Foote, M.J., & Foote, F.H. (1985) Gender differences in sexual attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48 (6) 1630-1642.
- Howard, J.A., Blumstein, P. & Schwartz, P. (1987) Social or evolutionary theories? Some observations on preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53 (1) 194-200.

- Kelley, H.H., Berscheid, E., Christensen, A., Harvey, J.H., Huston, T., Levinger, G., McClintock, E., Peplau, L.A., & Peterson, D.R., (1983) *Close Relationships*. W.H Freeman and Co. New York.
- Kurdek, L.A., & Schmitt, J.P. (1986) Relationship quality of gay men in closed or open relationships. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 12 (2) 85-99.
- Kurdek, L.A., & Schmitt, J.P. (1987) Perceived emotional support from family and friends in members of homosexual, married, and heterosexual cohabiting couples. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 14 (3-4) 57-68.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1987) Sex role schema and psychological adjustment in coupled homosexual and heterosexual men and women. *Sex Roles*, 17 (9-10) 549-562.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1988) Perceived social support in gays and lesbians in cohabiting relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54 (3) 504-509.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1988) Relationship quality of gay and lesbian cohabiting couples. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 15 (3/4) 93-118.
- Kurdek, L.A. (1989) Relationship quality in gay and lesbian cohabiting couples: A 1-year follow-up study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6, 35-59.
- Lynch, J.M., & Reilly, M.E. (1986) Role relationships: Lesbian perspectives. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 12 (2) 53-69.
- Macklin, E.D., & Rubin, R.H. (Eds.) (1983) *Contemporary Families and Alternative Lifestyles*. Sage Publications, Inc. California.

- Mallen, C.A. (1983) Sex role stereotypes, gender identity and parental relationships in male homosexuals and heterosexuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 9, 55-74.
- Oppenheim, A.N. (1966) *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. Basic Books Inc. New York.
- Richardson, D. (1983-1984) The dilemma of essentiality in homosexual theory. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 9 (2-3) 79-80.
- Riddle, D.I. (1978) Relating to children: Gays as role models. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34 (3) 38-58.
- Rosenman, M.F. (1978) Liking, loving and styles of loving. *Psychological Reports*, 42, 1243-1246.
- Rusbult, C.E., Morrow, G.D., & Johnson, D.J. (1987) Self-esteem and problem solving behaviour in close relationships. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 293-303.
- Serdahely, W.J., & Ziemba, G.J. (1984) Changing homophobia through college sexuality education. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 10 (1-2) 109-116.
- Steck, L., Levitan, D., McLane, D., & Kelley, H.H. (1982) Care, need and conceptions of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43 (3) 481-491.
- Tuller, N.R. (1978) Couples: The hidden segment of the gay world. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 3 (4) 331-343.

- Tyson, P. (1982) A developmental line of gender identity, gender role and choice of love object. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 30 (1) 61-86.
- Vetere, V.A. (1982 Win) The role of friendship in the development and maintenance of lesbian love relationships. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 8 (2) 51-65.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: HOMOSEXUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY ABOUT CURRENT ISSUES

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire deals with the comparison of homosexual and heterosexual relationships and attitudes toward homosexuality.

Please answer ALL the questions on the following pages. There are no RIGHT or WRONG answers, I just want your views on the issues.

The questionnaire is ANONYMOUS so there is no need to put your name on it. There is no way that the researcher can discover who gave the responses on each questionnaire, and in fact, it is of no advantage to the researcher to know such information.

Please answer each question HONESTLY and ACCURATELY. Answer the questions on your own; please do not consult with others.

It is very important to follow the procedure CAREFULLY.

SCORING PROCEDURE

Some of the questions simply require you to place a tick in the box that applies to you, or your answer.

The majority of the questions, however, require that you read each statement carefully and respond to each on a 1 - 5 scale, indicating your level of agreement or disagreement as follows:

1 = strongly agree

2 = moderately agree

3 = neutral, neither agree nor disagree.

4 = moderately disagree

5 = strongly disagree

Mark your answer (1,2,3,4 or 5) in the brackets provided.

EXAMPLE 1: "The drinking age should be lowered to 18 years of age."(2)

If you moderately agree with this statement you would place the number 2 in the brackets, as shown above.

PLEASE PLACE A TICK IN THE BOX THAT APPLIES TO YOU

SEX: Male

Female

AGE: 0-20 years

21-30 years

31-40 years

41-50 years

61-70 years

71 +

MARITAL STATUS: Married

Divorced

Single

Defacto

In a Relationship

Please indicate years and/or months together in your current relationship:

_____years/_____months

If you are not currently in a relationship, please indicate the length of your most significant (serious) relationship:

_____years/_____months

If you have not had a serious relationship please continue to fill out the questionnaire regardless.

Please read the following statements carefully, and place a tick in the box beside that which best describes your sexual behaviours and/or feelings. (You may turn to the appendix at the back of this questionnaire for a fuller description of these statements.)

- 1) Exclusively heterosexual.
- 2) Mainly heterosexual.
- 3) Mainly heterosexual but with a substantial degree of homosexuality.
- 4) As much heterosexual as homosexual.
- 5) Mainly homosexual with a substantial degree of heterosexuality.
- 6) Mainly homosexual.
- 7) Exclusively homosexual.

SECTION A:

Please consider the following statements with your CURRENT or most SIGNIFICANT (as the case may be) love relationship in mind. If you have never been in love, answer in terms of your IDEAL love relationship. Rate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements in light of this, by writing the APPROPRIATE NUMBER in the brackets provided. (The blank spaces refer to the person you are thinking of.)

1 = Strongly agree

2 = moderately agree

3 = neutral, neither agree nor disagree

4 = moderately disagree

5 = strongly disagree

- 1) If _____ were feeling bad, my first duty would be to cheer him/her up.
- 2) I feel that I can confide in _____ about virtually everything.
- 3) I would find it easy to ignore _____'s faults.
- 4) I would do almost anything for _____.
- 5) I feel very possessive toward _____.
- 6) If I could never be with _____, I would feel miserable.
- 7) If I were lonely, my first thought would be to seek _____ out.
- 8) One of my primary concerns is _____'s welfare.
- 9) I would forgive _____ for practically anything.
- 10) I feel responsible for _____'s well-being.
- 11) When I am with _____, I spend a good deal of time just looking at him/her.
- 12) I would greatly enjoy being confided in by _____.
- 13) It would be hard for me to get along without _____.
- 14) When I am with _____, we are almost always in the same mood.

- 15) I think that _____ is unusually well-adjusted.
- 16) I would highly recommend _____ for a responsible job.
- 17) In my opinion, _____ is an exceptionally mature person.
- 18) I have great confidence in _____'s good judgement.
- 19) Most people would react favourably to _____ after a brief acquaintance.
- 20) I think that _____ and I are quite similar to one another.
- 21) I would vote for _____ in a class or group election.
- 22) I think that _____ is one of those people who quickly wins respect.
- 23) I feel that _____ is an extremely intelligent person.
- 24) _____ is one of the most likeable people I know.
- 25) _____ is the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.
- 26) It seems to me that it is very easy for _____ to gain admiration.

SECTION C:

Please answer the next FOUR questions by CIRCLING the response you most agree with:

- 1) The romantic love between two (gay) males is quite different from the love between two persons of the opposite sex?

AGREE / DISAGREE

- 2) The romantic love between two females (lesbians) is quite different from the love between two persons of the opposite sex?

AGREE / DISAGREE

- 3) Do you think that male homosexuals are capable of having an enduring romantic relationship with a same sex partner?

YES / NO

- 4) Do you think that female homosexuals (lesbians) are capable of having an enduring romantic relationship with a same sex partner?

YES / NO

APPENDIX:

- 1) Rate yourself as 1 if all of your sexual feelings and behaviours are directed toward persons of the opposite sex.
- 2) Rate yourself as 2 if your sexual feelings and behaviours are directed almost entirely toward individuals of the opposite sex, but you incidentally have sexual feelings and/or sexual contact with individuals of the same sex.
- 3) Rate yourself as 3 if the majority of your sexual behaviours and feelings are heterosexual but you respond rather definitely to homosexual stimuli and/or have had more than incidental homosexual experience.
- 4) Rate yourself as 4 if you consider yourself to be equally homosexual and heterosexual in your sexual feelings and behaviours. That is, you accept both types of contact and have no strong preference for one or the other.
- 5) Rate yourself as 5 if your sexual feelings and behaviours are more often directed toward individuals of your own sex, but you still maintain a fair amount of contact with members of the opposite sex.
- 6) Rate yourself as 6 if you are almost entirely homosexual in your sexual feelings and behaviours and maintain only incidental sexual contact with the opposite sex.
- 7) Rate yourself as 7 if all of your sexual feelings and behaviours are directed toward individuals of the same sex.

APPENDIX 11: HETEROSEXUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY ABOUT CURRENT ISSUES

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire deals with the comparison of homosexual and heterosexual relationships and attitudes toward homosexuality.

Please answer ALL the questions on the following pages. There are no RIGHT or WRONG answers, I just want your views on the issues.

The questionnaire is ANONYMOUS so there is no need to put your name on it. There is no way that the researcher can discover who gave the responses on each questionnaire, and in fact, it is of no advantage to the researcher to know such information.

Please answer each question HONESTLY and ACCURATELY. Answer the questions on your own; please do not consult with others.

It is very important to follow the procedure CAREFULLY.

SCORING PROCEDURE

Some of the questions simply require you to place a tick in the box that applies to you, or your answer.

The majority of the questions, however, require that you read each statement carefully and respond to each on a 1 - 5 scale, indicating your level of agreement or disagreement as follows:

- 1 = strongly agree
- 2 = moderately agree
- 3 = neutral, neither agree nor disagree.
- 4 = moderately disagree
- 5 = strongly disagree

Mark your answer (1,2,3,4 or 5) in the brackets provided.

EXAMPLE 1: "The drinking age should be lowered to 18 years of age."(2)

If you moderately agree with this statement you would place the number 2 in the brackets, as shown above.

PLEASE PLACE A TICK IN THE BOX THAT APPLIES TO YOU

SEX: Male

Female

AGE: 0-20 years

21-30 years

31-40 years

41-50 years

61-70 years

71 +

MARITAL STATUS: Married

Divorced

Single

Defacto

In a Relationship

Please indicate years and/or months together in your current relationship:

_____years/_____months

If you are not currently in a relationship, please indicate the length of your most significant (serious) relationship:

_____years/_____months

If you have not had a serious relationship please continue to fill out the questionnaire regardless.

Please read the following statements carefully, and place a tick in the box beside that which best describes your sexual behaviours and/or feelings. (You may turn to the appendix at the back of this questionnaire for a fuller description of these statements.)

1) Exclusively heterosexual.

2) Mainly heterosexual.

3) Mainly heterosexual but with a substantial degree of homosexuality.

4) As much heterosexual as homosexual.

5) Mainly homosexual with a substantial degree of heterosexuality.

6) Mainly homosexual.

7) Exclusively homosexual.

If you rated yourself as 1 or 2 on the scale on the previous page please fill out the ENTIRE questionnaire.

If you rated yourself as 3,4,5,6 or 7 please answer ONLY the questions on pages 4 and 5 (Section A) and the FOUR questions on page 8 (Section C).

SECTION A:

Please consider the following statements with your CURRENT or most SIGNIFICANT (as the case may be) love relationship in mind. If you have never been in love, answer in terms of your IDEAL love relationship. Rate the extent to which you agree/disagree with the following statements in light of this, by writing the APPROPRIATE NUMBER in the brackets provided. (The blank spaces refer to the person you are thinking of.)

1 = Strongly agree

2 = moderately agree

3 = neutral, neither agree nor disagree

4 = moderately disagree

5 = strongly disagree

- 1) If _____ were feeling bad, my first duty would be to cheer him/her up.
- 2) I feel that I can confide in _____ about virtually everything.
- 3) I would find it easy to ignore _____ 's faults.
- 4) I would do almost anything for _____.
- 5) I feel very possessive toward _____.
- 6) If I could never be with _____, I would feel miserable.
- 7) If I were lonely, my first thought would be to seek _____ out.
- 8) One of my primary concerns is _____'s welfare.
- 9) I would forgive _____ for practically anything.
- 10) I feel responsible for _____'s well-being.
- 11) When I am with _____, I spend a good deal of time just looking at him/her.
- 12) I would greatly enjoy being confided in by _____.
- 13) It would be hard for me to get along without _____.
- 14) When I am with _____, we are almost always in the same mood.

- 15) I think that _____ is unusually well-adjusted.
- 16) I would highly recommend _____ for a responsible job.
- 17) In my opinion, _____ is an exceptionally mature person.
- 18) I have great confidence in _____'s good judgement.
- 19) Most people would react favourably to _____ after a brief acquaintance.
- 20) I think that _____ and I are quite similar to one another.
- 21) I would vote for _____ in a class or group election.
- 22) I think that _____ is one of those people who quickly wins respect.
- 23) I feel that _____ is an extremely intelligent person.
- 24) _____ is one of the most likeable people I know.
- 25) _____ is the sort of person whom I myself would like to be.
- 26) It seems to me that it is very easy for _____ to gain admiration.

SECTION B:

On rating the next set of statements, please answer with FEMALE homosexuals (Lesbians) in mind. For each statement please WRITE IN THE NUMBER which best reflects your opinion.

1 = strongly agree

2 = moderately agree

3 = neutral, neither agree nor disagree

4 = moderately disagree

5 = strongly disagree

- 1) I enjoy the company of homosexuals.
- 2) It would be beneficial to society to recognise homosexuality as normal.
- 3) Homosexuals should not be allowed to work with children.
- 4) Homosexuality is immoral.
- 5) Homosexuality is a mental disorder
- 6) All homosexual bars should be closed down.
- 7) Homosexuals are mistreated in our society.
- 8) Homosexuals should be given social equality.
- 9) Homosexuals are a viable part of our society.
- 10) Homosexuals should have equal opportunity employment.
- 11) There is no reason to restrict the places where homosexuals work.
- 12) Homosexuals should be free to date whomever they want.
- 13) Homosexuality is a sin.
- 14) Homosexuals do need psychological treatment.
- 15) Homosexuality endangers the institution of the family.
- 16) Homosexuals should be accepted completely into our society.
- 17) Homosexuals should be barred from the teaching profession.
- 18) Those in favour of homosexuality tend to be homosexuals themselves.
- 19) There should be no restrictions on homosexuality.

20) I avoid homosexuals wherever possible.

SECTION C:

Please answer the next FOUR questions by CIRCLING the response you most agree with:

- 1) The romantic love between two (gay) males is quite different from the love between two persons of the opposite sex?

AGREE / DISAGREE

- 2) The romantic love between two females (lesbians) is quite different from the love between two persons of the opposite sex?

AGREE / DISAGREE

- 3) Do you think that male homosexuals are capable of having an enduring romantic relationship with a same sex partner?

YES / NO

- 4) Do you think that female homosexuals (lesbians) are capable of having an enduring romantic relationship with a same sex partner?

YES / NO

SECTION D:

For the statements listed below, please express your feelings about each statement by indicating your level of agreement or disagreement, in the usual manner.

1 = strongly agree

2 = moderately agree

3 = neutral, neither agree nor disagree

4 = moderately disagree

5 = strongly disagree

1) Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.

2) Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.

3) Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.

4) Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.

5) Intoxication among women is far worse than intoxication among men.

6) Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.

7) It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.

8) There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.

9) A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.

10) Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.

11) Women earning as much as their partners should bear equally the expense when they go out together.

- 12) Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
- 13) A woman should not expect to go exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man..
- 14) Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to university than daughters.
- 15) It is ridiculous for a woman to run a train and for a man to darn socks.
- 16) In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in The bringing of the children.
- 17) Women should not be encouraged to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiances.
- 18) The husband should not be favoured by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
- 19) Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house-keeping, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.
- 20) The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
- 21) Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity that has been set up by men.
- 22) On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.
- 23) There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.
- 24) Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
- 25) The modern female is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern male.

SECTION E:

On rating the next set of statements, please answer with MALE homosexuals in mind. For each statement please WRITE IN THE NUMBER which best reflects your opinion.

- 1 = strongly agree
- 2 = moderately agree
- 3 = neutral, neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = moderately disagree
- 5 = strongly disagree

- 1) I enjoy the company of homosexuals.
- 2) It would be beneficial to society to recognise homosexuality as normal.
- 3) Homosexuals should not be allowed to work with children.
- 4) Homosexuality is immoral.
- 5) Homosexuality is a mental disorder.
- 6) All homosexual bars should be closed down.
- 7) Homosexuals are mistreated in our society.
- 8) Homosexuals should be given social equality.
- 9) Homosexuals are a viable part of our society.
- 10) Homosexuals should have equal opportunity employment.
- 11) There is no reason to restrict the places where homosexuals work.
- 12) Homosexuals should be free to date whomever they want.
- 13) Homosexuality is a sin.
- 14) Homosexuals do need psychological treatment.
- 15) Homosexuality endangers the institution of the family.
- 16) Homosexuals should be accepted completely into our society.
- 17) Homosexuals should be barred from the teaching profession.
- 18) Those in favour of homosexuality tend to be homosexuals themselves.
- 19) There should be no restrictions on homosexuality.

20) I avoid homosexuals wherever possible.

APPENDIX:

- 1) Rate yourself as 1 if all of your sexual feelings and behaviours are directed toward persons of the opposite sex.
- 2) Rate yourself as 2 if your sexual feelings and behaviours are directed almost entirely toward individuals of the opposite sex, but you incidentally have sexual feelings and/or sexual contact with individuals of the same sex.
- 3) Rate yourself as 3 if the majority of your sexual behaviours and feelings are heterosexual but you respond rather definitely to homosexual stimuli and/or have had more than incidental homosexual experience.
- 4) Rate yourself as 4 if you consider yourself to be equally homosexual and heterosexual in your sexual feelings and behaviours. That is, you accept both types of contact and have no strong preference for one or the other.
- 5) Rate yourself as 5 if your sexual feelings and behaviours are more often directed toward individuals of your own sex, but you still maintain a fair amount of contact with members of the opposite sex.
- 6) Rate yourself as 6 if you are almost entirely homosexual in your sexual feelings and behaviours and maintain only incidental sexual contact with the opposite sex.
- 7) Rate yourself as 7 if all of your sexual feelings and behaviours are directed toward individuals of the same sex.

APPENDIX 111

STATISTICAL TABLES

LIKING AND LOVING SCALES.

TEST 1:

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: (LOVE BY GROUP)

SOURCE	D.F	SS	MS	F.RATIO	PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	3	247.8609	82.6203	1.3633	.2587
WITHIN GROUPS	96	5817.9291	60.6034		
TOTAL	99	6065.79			

SCHEFFE:

No two groups significantly different at the 0.050 level.

TEST 2:

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: (LIKE BY GROUP)

SOURCE	D.F	SS	MS	F.RATIO	PROB.
BETWEEN GROUPS	3	115.9165	38.6388	.4789	.6977
WITHIN GROUPS	93	7502.7433	80.6747		
TOTAL	96	7618.6598			

SCHEFFE:

No two groups significantly different at the 0.050 level.

(HATH-M BY SEX)

TEST 6: MANOVA**(HATH-M HATH-F BY SEX)**

SOURCE	SS	D.F	MS	F	SIG/F
WITHIN CELLS	19459.17	47	414.02		
SEX	5338.03	1	5338.03	12.89	.001
WITHIN CELLS	629.89	47	13.40		
HOMSEX	17.03	1	17.03	1.27	.265
SEX BY HOMSEX	10.09	1	10.09	.75	.390

APPENDIX V
STATISTICAL TABLES
ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE

TEST 7: PEARSON CORRELATION.

(AWS WITH HATH)

VARIABLE	N.	MEAN	S.D
AWS	48	37.83	10.38
HATH	49	41.85	16.07

Pearson correlation coefficient. $r = .7254$ (47) $p = .000$

APPENDIX V1

STATISTICS RELATING TO THE STUDY SAMPLE.

GROUP:	FREQ.%	CUM.%
<hr/>		
GROUP 1	27	27
Male homosexual		
GROUP 2	23	50
Female homosexual		
GROUP 3	27	77
Male heterosexual		
GROUP 4	23	100
Female heterosexual		

TABLE 11: Frequency and cumulative percent of the number of subjects in each group.

AGE:	FREQ.%	CUM.%
<hr/>		
0-20 YEARS	29	29
21-30 YEARS	62	91
31-40 YEARS	9	100

TABLE 12: Frequency and cumulative percent of the number of subjects in each age bracket.

MARITAL STATUS:	FREQ.%	CUM.%
MARRIED:	1	1
DIVORCED	3	4.1
SINGLE	51	56.1
DEFACTO	9	65.3
IN RELATIONSHIP	34	100
MISSING CASES	2	

TABLE 13: Frequency and cumulative percent of the number of subjects in each marital status category.

RELATIONSHIP LENGTH:	FREQ.%	CUM.%
NO RELATIONSHIP	15	15
<=1 YEAR	51	66
> 1 YEAR <=3 YEARS	26	92
> 3 YEARS <=5 YEARS	5	97
> 5 YEARS <=7 YEARS	1	98
> 9 YEARS <=11 YEARS	1	99
>11 YEARS <=13 YEARS	1	100

TABLE 14: Frequency and cumulative percent of the number of subjects in each relationship category.

SEXUAL		
ORIENTATION:	FREQ.%	CUM.%

EXCLUSIVELY		
HETEROSEXUAL	48	48
MAINLY		
HETEROSEXUAL	2	50
MAINLY HOMOSEXUAL		
BUT LARGE DEGREE OF		
HETEROSEXUALITY	2	52
MAINLY HOMOSEXUAL	8	60
EXCLUSIVELY		
HOMOSEXUAL	40	100

TABLE 15: Frequency and cumulative percent of the number of subjects in each sexual orientation category.